# Daily Report

# Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-094
Tuesday
18 May 1993

# Daily Report
## Central Eurasia

*FBIS-SOV-93-094* *18 May 1993*

CONTENTS

**NOTICE TO READERS:** An • indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

### INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS


Shaposhnikov: Russia Supports Collective Security *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 1
Latvian Envoy on Russian 'Defeat' at Council of Europe *[BNS]* ..... 1
Internal Affairs Ministers Agree To Fight Crime *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 15 May]* ..... 1
Antimonopoly Organs Agree on Cooperation Mechanism *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 14 May]* ..... 2
Black Sea Fleet Boat 'Escaped' Crimean Base for Ukraine *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 2
ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 15 May ..... 2
For 18 May ..... 3


### RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS


Kozyrev To Hold Consultations on Yugoslav Crisis *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 5
Comments on Serb Referendum *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 5
Arrives in Berlin *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 5
Kozyrev, Kinkel Comment *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 5
Churkin on Implementation of Vance-Owen Plan *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 6
Press Comments on Yugoslav Situation ..... 6
Diplomacy Warned of Dangers *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 May]* ..... 6
Warning on Rushing Into Conflict *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 May]* ..... 7
'Shock Assault' Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 18 May]* ..... 8
Serbs Said Divided *[IZVESTIYA 18 May]* ..... 9
PRAVDA Criticizes German Moves *[18 May]* ..... 9
West Said Imposing Plan *[PRAVDA 18 May]* ..... 10
Head of Russian UNPROFOR Contingent Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* ..... 11
Grachev Comments on Issues at News Conference ..... 11
Wants Agreement on Bosnia *[Moscow TV]* ..... 11
Views Turkey Visit, Georgia Talks *[Moscow TV]* ..... 12
Says Azerbaijan Imports Weapons *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 12
Wants Azerbaijan To Extradite Servicemen *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 12
Talks on Nagorno-Karabakh Reportedly End in Failure *[AFP]* ..... 12
Condemned Soldiers in Azerbaijan May Be Swapped for Arms *[Moscow TV]* ..... 13
Rutskoy Urges Pardon *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 13
Kuzbass Demands Handover *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 13
Yeltsin Cited on Talks With Shevardnadze *[Tbilisi Radio]* ..... 13
Shokhin Comments on Possibility of Economic Union *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 14
Further Reaction to U.S. Decision on Abandoning SDI ..... 14
Step in Right Direction *[Moscow International]* ..... 14
START II Played Decisive Role *[IZVESTIYA 15 may]* ..... 14
Commentary on U.S. Moves To Resume Nuclear Testing *[Moscow International]* ..... 15
Shumeyko Visits U.S., Views Constitutional Process *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 16
Polish Deputy Premier Meets Chernomyrdin, Shokhin *[Warsaw PAP]* ..... 16
Talks Conclude *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 17
Western Group of Forces Commander Discusses Withdrawal *[Moscow TV]* ..... 17
Exchange of Workers with Germany Agreed *[Russian TV]* ..... 18
Spy Who Fled Sweden Said To Pick Up Fee From Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 14 May]* ..... 18
Nakasone Regrets Yeltsin Visit Postponement *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 18
Embassy in Japan Denies Reversion to Old Policies *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 19
Vietnamese Envoy Calls on Khasbulatov *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 14 May]* ..... 19
Delegation Head Comments on Talks in Havana *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 19

## RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

### Political Issues

Yeltsin Meets With Democratic Representatives 17 May ..... 21
Committee Issues Statement *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 21
Yeltsin Draft Should Be 'Basis' *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 21
Yeltsin Cited on Constitution *[Moscow TV]* ..... 21
New Constitution Will Be 'Full Victory' *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 21
Democrats Abolishing 'Anti-Market Structures' *[Moscow TV]* ..... 22
Defense Ministry Not Against Yeltsin Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 22
Grachev Outlines Military Doctrine, Use of Nuclear Arms *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 22
Zorkin Interviewed on Constitution Issues *[Russian TV]* ..... 22
Yeltsin Draft Seen as Threat to Democracy *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 14 May]* ..... 26
Presidental Staffer on Constitution Drafts *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 14 May]* ..... 28
Security Bodies Slack on Constitutional Order *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 30
Khasbulatov Views 'Crisis of State' *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 15 May]* ..... 30
More on Zorkin Speech to Regional Leaders *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 14 May]* ..... 37
More on Council of Ministers Presidium Session *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 15 May]* ..... 38
New Government Press Service Chief Appointed *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 39

### Regional Affairs

Caucasian 'Highlanders' May Act Against Russian Interests *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 39
Officials Assess Situation *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 15 May]* ..... 40
Moscow Leaflets Urge Expulsion of Caucasus Visitors *[SEGODNYA 14 May]* ..... 40
Situation in N. Caucasus Said Under Control *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 40
Regional Officials, Shakhray Discuss Constitution *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 41
Regional Leaders Support Yeltsin's Draft Constitution *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 18 May]* ..... 41
Kuzbass Threatens Reprisals for Penalizing Russian Soldiers *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 42
Kemerovo Official Expresses Concern Over Rutskoy Visit *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 42
Oblast Administration Personnel Changes Reported *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 14 May]* ..... 42

## UKRAINE

### International Affairs

Delegations Work Out Recommendations on Black Sea Fleet *[Kiev International]* ..... 43
Republican Party Statement on Relations With Russia *[NARODNA HAZETA May]* ..... 43
Shipping Company Demands Action Over UN Sanctions Losses *[Kiev International]* ..... 43
* Ukraine's Ethnic Hungarian Minority Expands Activities ..... 43
* Meeting With Deputy Secretary *[Uzhhorod IGAZ SZO 17 Apr]* ..... 43
* Hungarian Scientific Association *[Uzhhorod IGAZ SZO 17 Apr]* ..... 44
* Hungarian Children's Association *[Uzhhorod IGAZ SZO 3 Apr]* ..... 44

### National Affairs

Kuchma Interviewed on Government's Economic Program *[URYADOVYY KURYER 15 May]* ... 45

## CAUCASUS

### Armenia

Spokesman on CIS Integration, Tripartite Meeting *[Yerevan International]* ..... 49
Views Outcome of Negotiations With Russia *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 49

### Azerbaijan

Presidential Spokesman Comments on Moscow Talks *[TURAN]* ..... 49
Court Offical Sees No Reason To Release Russian Soldiers *[TURAN]* ..... 50
Elchibey Sends Congratulations to Turkey's New President *[Baku Radio]* ..... 50

### Georgia

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Relations With Russia *[Tbilisi Radio]* ..... 50
Reported Buildup of Russian Forces Protested *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 53
Shevardnadze Appoints Representative to Russia *[ITAR-TASS]* ..... 53
Ioseliani on Abkhazian Conflict, Russian Involvement *[Russian TV]* ..... 53
Iran's Velayati Postpones Visit *[Tbilisi Radio]* ..... 55
Foreign Minister, German Envoy Discuss Shevardnadze Visit *[Tbilisi Radio]* ..... 55

## BALTIC STATES

### Estonia

Strobe Talbott Meets President, Prime Minister *[Tallinn International]* ..... 56
President Hails Membership in Council of Europe *[BNS]* ..... 56
Velliste Says Membership Offers 'Protective Shield' *[BNS]* ..... 56
Defense Ministry Chancellor Dismissed *[Tallinn International]* ..... 56
Swedish Defense Minister Arrives on Visit *[Tallinn Radio]* ..... 56

### Latvia

State Minister Views Russian Troop Withdrawal Talks *[Riga Radio]* ..... 57
Russian Team Suggests Army Remain Until 2003 *[Riga Radio]* ..... 57
Prime Minister Meets With IMF Experts *[Riga Radio]* ..... 57
Swedish Defense Minister Offers Military Hardware *[Stockholm Radio]* ..... 57
German Bundestag President Meets With Leaders *[Hamburg DPA]* ..... 58

## Shaposhnikov: Russia Supports Collective Security

*LD1705161293 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1225 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, held a news conference today on the results of the sitting of the Council of Defense Ministers of Commonwealth member states. The news conference took place at the headquarters of the Main Command of the Joint Armed Forces in Moscow. This is how Marshal Shaposhnikov responded to a question from Mayak correspondent Tatyana Chemodanova:

[Begin recording] [Chemodanova] Yevgeniy Ivanovich, what is Russia's stand—its president's, parliament's, and Defense Ministry's—on the issue of military integration? I would also like to know whether there are differences of opinion among these bodies.

[Shaposhnikov] There have been reverberations in the press in the wake of our meeting here on 13 May at the level of defense ministers or their deputies—in a word, leaderships of military departments. It has been said that Russia was left on its own, in the minority, that it rejects collective security, and so on. This is not so. Russia does not reject collective security. Words to this effect have been spoken by the president—I refer in particular to his statements of 17 March and 16 April. There he talked about collective security and about perfecting the mechanism, filling it with specific content, including improvements in the structure of the Main Command as such. This is what we are guided by, and we regard it as a good incentive, since the Russian president has repeatedly talked about it—hence this political will has to be expressed now in the documents that we have.

Now about parliament. I know that the majority in parliament is determined that collective security should be there, as well as military integration. On the other hand, certain representatives of parliament, on whom decisionmaking depends, say that the Tashkent treaty is too rigid. In this case, we ask the Russian parliament either to ratify it, or to send credentials to all the member states of the collective security treaty so that they can introduce some substantial amendments to those points that make ratification by the Russian parliament impossible.

Now about the Defense Ministry. Here again, I have not heard once from the defense minister or from other Russian Federation officials that they oppose collective security. They stand for collective security. If we take, say, Belarus, Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and other states—each state has just one strategy, and that is collective security. Those states have different approaches, also manifested within the Main Command, with regard to the form, the specifics, the practical content of the strategy—but this is by no means an obstacle, and no reason to reject collective security or military integration. [end recording]

## Latvian Envoy on Russian 'Defeat' at Council of Europe

*WS1705091493 Tallinn BNS in English 1903 GMT 14 May 93*

[Text] Riga, May 14, BNS—Russia suffered the most severe diplomatic defeat when failed to avert the acceptance of Estonia in the Council of Europe's Parliamentary Assembly (CEPA), Latvian envoy to the CEPA, Andrejs Pantelejevs, told reporters Friday.

Pantalejevs described the CEPA session Thursday as historic, since the Estonian acceptance was endorsed by the overwhelming majority of voters, despite of the Russian bids to attain the contrary.

Russia will have to seriously revise its foreign policies regarding Latvia, he said, especially in view of its earlier accusations on the human rights restrictions in Latvia and Estonia.

Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev reportedly submitted an open letter to all CEPA delegations, urging them to focus attention on "mass-scale abuses of human rights in Estonia." But, the accusations did not find supporters from amidst the CE members, with an exception of Greek Communist Korakas.

However, Pantalejevs said, there was no unanimity within the Russian delegation itself. Several Russian delegates favored Estonia's acceptance to the CEPA. The Russian delegation participates in the CEPA work with a special guest status.

Latvia's acceptance can be forwarded only after completion of free and democratic elections in Latvia. The elections, scheduled for June 5-6, will be assessed by 11 international observers.

Lithuania and Estonia were the first of the ex-Soviet republics to win membership in the CEPA.

## Internal Affairs Ministers Agree To Fight Crime

*MK1505130093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 15 May 93 p 21*

[Aleksandr Danilkin report: "Internal Affairs Ministers Meet in Yerevan. Agreement Reached To Meet Regularly"]

[Text] The last participants in the conference of internal affairs ministers of the states of the former USSR left Yerevan yesterday. This was the fifth meeting of the chiefs of the law-enforcement agencies. Those attending the meeting, while noting that crime lacks national barriers, came to the conclusion that these barriers should not hinder those who fight crime. The ministers discussed the possibilities for cooperating to fight organized crime as well as technical and logistical support. They agreed to hold similar meetings on a regular basis.

Out of all the republics of the former Soviet Union, the only ones not to show up for the meeting were representatives from Azerbaijan (because of the republic's difficult situation in terms of criminal activity), Lithuania (because of domestic political difficulties), and Moldova (the chief of the delegation fell ill). But even these states did not refuse to cooperate in crime fighting.

Vladimir Vorozhtsov, chief of the Russian Ministry of Internal Affairs public relations center, told a KOMMERSANT-DAILY correspondent that one of the focal points of the meeting was the discussion of an agreement on cooperation in technical and crime analysis support for operational and day-to-day activities. Before the USSR broke up, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs' expert appraisal and crime-analysis center handled orders for conducting 60 types of wide-ranging expert appraisals. A new agreement will make it possible to use available experience and to exchange technological information and technologies themselves. As a matter of fact, the Russian Ministry of Internal Affairs is now setting up a combined data and "exhibit" base, which the participants in the meeting agreed to replenish jointly. It will collect samples of cartridge cases, bullets, false banknotes, and so forth.

According to available information, the states that were not represented at the meeting are also willing to join the agreement (the only thing that is still unclear is what stance will be taken by representatives of the Azerbaijani Ministry of Internal Affairs).

Another important aspect to the meeting, according to Vladimir Vorozhtsov, was the discussion of the requisite conditions for an early application of the Convention on the Extradition of Criminals (in January 1993 it was signed by the leaders of the majority of the former USSR republics). The only state to have ratified it so far, however, has been Turkmenistan.

The meeting paid particular attention to the problems concerning the fight with organized crime that has reached interregional and interstate levels. As a matter of fact, Armenia and Russia signed a bilateral agreement on the subject.

The ministers agreed to hold the next meeting in August-September, either in Turkmenistan or in Russia. Specific issues scheduled for discussion include problems of the transportation of detainees and logistical support for the law-enforcement agencies.

According to reports received by KOMMERSANT-DAILY, Russian Internal Affairs Minister Viktor Yerin called the meeting very fruitful and said that its results made it possible to count on effective and mutually advantageous cooperation in the future.

## Antimonopoly Organs Agree on Cooperation Mechanism

*PM1705134393 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 May 93 First Edition p 4*

[Report from INTERFAX and RIA NOVOSTI roundup: "Destined To Cooperate"]

[Text] The participants in the conference of leaders of the antimonopoly organs of CIS countries held in Moscow have declared their readiness to cooperate in pursuing a coordinated antimonpoly policy.

Representatives of all the republics of the former USSR except Lithuania took part in the conference. This is the first joint event of its kind within the framework of the agreement "On the Coordination of Antimonopoly Policy" signed by the CIS countries on 12 March 1993. "We are destined to cooperate," Leonid Bochin, chairman of the Russian State Committee for Antimonopoly Policy, said when summing up the conference's results at a news conference. "We have much in common, first and foremost the legacy we inherited from the Union." The conference participants stressed the need to achieve uniformity in establishing the criteria and means of assessing monopoly activity and agreed on the creation of a mechanism for cooperation among the state organs pursuing antimonopoly policy.

## Black Sea Fleet Boat 'Escaped' Crimean Base for Ukraine

*LD1805090893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0809 GMT 18 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Roman Zadunaiski]

[Text] Moscow May 18 TASS—A fire boat of the Black Sea Fleet hoisted the Ukrainian flag and escaped from its base in the Crimea to Ukrainian authorities on the island of Maiski, TASS learned from the press centre of the Black Sea Fleet on Tuesday.

A 17-men crew enlisted by contracts and under the commander of Vladimir Musienko defected not for political reasons, but because they refused to serve away from their families, according to the Crimean Naval Base.

The incident caused indignation of Black Sea Fleet officers who demanded to raise St. Andrew's Russian flag on warships, the press centre said.

Last year another ship of the disputed Black Sea Fleet fled from its base in the Crimea, hoisted the Ukrainian flag, and arrived into the Ukrainian port of Odessa.

## ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 15 May

*LD1505092593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0913 GMT 15 May 93*

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 15 ITAR-TASS—The discussion of the new draft constitution of the Russian Federation remains in the focus of attention of the press. NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA publishes the statement of heads of parliaments of the republics, integrated in the Russian Federation, about the new draft constitution and the procedure of its adoption under the general headline "President's draft constitution and regional interests".

Commenting on the statement, the newspaper writes: "The active propaganda of the president's draft constitution seems to have brought about the reverse effect. Leaders of the former autonomous republics waited too long for the president to carry out his promise to turn the Federal Treaty into a real document. After April 25 Yeltsin needed again the influence of leaders from provinces, but he was in no hurry to pay the old bills." According to NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, the statement "could be regarded as a reclamation of the republics to the president," since "heads of parliaments of eleven out of 19 Russian republics actually rejected the president's draft constitution and 'the unconstitutional methods of its adoption', i.e. through the constitutional assembly".

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carries a report about the session of the CIS Council of Heads of State, held in Moscow on Friday, under the headline "President-Hotel used for the first time for its direct purpose". The newspaper stresses that the creation of the economic alliance of the CIS member states became the most important item on the agenda of the meeting.

Now we need a fresh view of the Commonwealth, a new constructive idea capable of removing mutual mistrust and other obstacles on the way to unification, Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev believes. Nazarbayev, one of the leaders who took an active part in the creation of the new Commonwealth, has expressed his attitude to the problem in an interview with KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. He believes it is necessary to proceed from the assumption, which is objective reality, that a single economic system has been created on the territory of the former Soviet Union during the years of its existence. After two years of "independent voyage" most states are getting back to this understanding of the historic role to be played by the new Commonwealth.

According to Nazarbayev, Kazakhstan's initiatives are aimed exclusively at forming the economic alliance. The preservation of a common economic space will make it possible to settle a considerable part of economic problems facing the CIS member states, he said.

Aside from it, he believes the CIS has another historic role to play, specifically, the restoration of the military-strategic balance in the modern world and the ensurance of the step-by-step reduction of conventional and strategic offensive armaments to the reasonably sufficient level. This is why he favours the preservation of the common defence space, inherited from the Soviet Union, and its adjustment to new political realities.

Chairman of the Russian Parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov has contributed an article to PRAVDA, which deals with some aspects of Russia's medieval history. He urges to analyse the roots of Russia's statehood and writes that "as a result of imposing upon society the anti-democratic constitutional changes, the idea is being hammered into the heads of Russians that there is nothing instructive in a more than a thousand-year-long history of Russia".

Khasbulatov analyses various forms of state set-up in Russia in various periods, as well as various aspects of relationship between the legislative and executive branches of authority in those times. He believes "the current soviets, which began to revive after 1990, ridding themselves of the patronage of party committed on various levels, are inseparably connected with the centuries-old tradition, with the traditional way of life of the Russians and other peoples inhabiting Russia".

He denounced the servility towards the West which, according to Khasbulatov, "has never brought fame to the government. Nor has it brought prosperity to the motherland, to the nation." Khasbulatov urges not to ignore "the experience of the Russian state, which is no less positive" along with the desire to use the positive world experience of world development.

Newspapers report the holding in Moscow on Friday of a working meeting of President Yeltsin and chairman of parliament of Georgia Eduard Shevardnadze, as well as the talks held by the two leaders. The press stresses that Shevardnadze expressed "complete satisfaction" with the results of the meeting at the press conference after the talks.

## For 18 May

*LD1805061993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0436 GMT 18 May 93*

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 18 TASS—By ITAR-TASS:

The results of last week's summit of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) here is the leading topic in today's Moscow press.

"There is every indication that centrifugal trends throughout the former Soviet Union have discontinued, giving way to the realisation of the need for unity, an economic one for now," writes KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR).

"This is precisely what enabled Boris Yeltsin to describe the summit as a serious stage and even as a turning-point in the life of the CIS," the newspaper points out. Participants in the CIS summit endorsed the idea of and the need to establish an economic union within the CIS framework.

The results of the Moscow summit are impressive," [no opening quotation mark as received] writes KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, pointing out that the leaders of CIS countries "have become more compliant." Their changed views "are an object lesson for those enthusiasts of 'regional independence' who may declare themselves inside Russia. So, the common sense shown by CIS politicians is sure to cool some hot heads in regions and former Russian autonomous entities".

Noting the probability of the emergence of an economic community within the CIS, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA (INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER) at the same time asks whether Russia will have to pay for a long-awaited integration at the cost of its own economic difficulties and whether a further political differentiation will be the consequence of economic rapprochement. The newspaper's opinion is that these are questions to be considered at subsequent extraordinary summits.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and PRAVDA also report the results of the Moscow summit. "Following a months-long lack of headway, the leaders of CIS countries, it seems, began to move ahead and made a marked progress at the Moscow summit," PRAVDA observes.

The press gives prominence to reports on the talks held in the Kremlin last Friday between the leaders of the Russian Federation and Georgia—Boris Yeltsin and Eduard Shevardnadze.

Recalling their reaffirmation of the need urgently to complete preparations for the conclusion of a "grand treaty" between the two countries, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, referring to a joint communique, points out at the same time that the two sides will seek to sign it as soon as possible provided there are auspicious conditions, a successful headway in a settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia, in particular". [no opening quotation mark as received]

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA also reports Saturday's meeting between General of the Army Pavel Grachev, Russian minister of defence, and Brigadier-General Georgiy Karkashvili, who was recently appointed Georgia's defence minister. The newspaper quotes the Russian minister as saying that an immediate cessation of fire by the conflicting sides must become the main condition for a solution to all issues.

The newspaper TRUD carries a dispatch from its correspondent about an increasing accident and mortality rate among miners at the coalmines of the Kuznetsk coal basin as a consequence of the "breakdown of labour discipline and performance", which has been brought about by a general economic crisis, a production slump, poor working conditions, latent unemployment, etc.

"A transition to market-determined relations requires a new approach to the organisation of a state labour safety system," TRUD emphasises in particular.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA reports details about the crash of a MI-8 helicopter on the Chukot peninsula on May 15. There were members of a Russo-French ethnographic expedition on board the helicopter.

## Kozyrev To Hold Consultations on Yugoslav Crisis

*LD1705120593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1055 GMT 17 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Staroselskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—President Boris Yeltsin instructed Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev to begin a series of intensive consultations to find a way to solve the crisis in former Yugoslavia, special presidential envoy Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing on Monday [17 May].

Kozyrev will first fly to Berlin to meet his German counterpart Klaus Kinkel. He will then proceed to split to meet Croatian President Franjo Tudjman and Chairman of the Parliament of Bosnia-Herzegovina Alija Izetbegovic.

In Belgrade the Russian foreign minister will hold talks with presidents of Yugoslavia and Serbia, Dobrica Cosic and Slobodan Milosevic, and possibly with President of Montenegro Momir Bulatovic.

Kozyrev will then fly to Rome to attend a meeting of foreign ministers of several West European countries, according to Churkin.

On May 20 he will arrive to Washington for consultations with the US Administration and will then go to New York to attend a session of the UN Security Council at the level of foreign ministers.

Russia currently chairs UN Security Council sessions.

### Comments on Serb Referendum

*LD1705121393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1121 GMT 17 may 93*

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Nikishov]

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—"We cannot reconcile with the results of a referendum held among Bosnian Serbs on the issue of territorial settlement in former Yugoslavia", Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev told reporters before meeting former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone on Monday [17 May].

Kozyrev added that the referendum results are "more than disputable".

### Arrives in Berlin

*LD1705190393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1833 GMT 17 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Konstantin Savvin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Berlin May 17 TASS—Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev arrived in Berlin on Monday [17 May] evening. Upon his arrival he began negotiations with German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel.

Arriving in Berlin the Russian foreign minister began a series of consultations with state leaders of European countries on the problem linked with the settlement of the crisis in former Yugoslavia to implement the Vance-Owen plan which envisages the political decision of the conflict. According to Kozyrev, the two sides discussed this important problem first of all.

### Kozyrev, Kinkel Comment

*LD1805061093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0532 GMT 18 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Konstantin Savvin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Berlin May 18 TASS—The Vance-Owen plan has "an unprecedented backing and approval in the world" at a present stage of a settlement of the Yugoslav drama. This creates a good basis to plan out specific moves to implement it consistently, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev told journalists here on Monday [17 May] night.

Kozyrev arrived in the German capital for consultations with his German counterpart, Klaus Kinkel, on matters related to a settlement of the crisis in the former Yugoslavia and the implementation of the Vance-Owen plan.

The problem will be considered on May 21 at a U.N. Security Council meeting at foreign ministers' level.

According to the Russian minister, it appears utterly important that the Vance-Owen plan has been supported by the state figures of the former Yugoslavia and that measures are being taken to establish safety zones and send observers to the line of delimitation between the warring sides.

At the same time Kozyrev warned that those forces which now oppose a settlement of the crisis "should be prepared to face any measures, including the toughest ones".

"Our arrival in Berlin is not some geographical fortuity or a zigzag of visits but the recognition of new realities in the present-day world", the Russian minister said. "We view Germany as a reliable partner and are convinced that the way to peace in Europe now runs through Berlin," Kozyrev emphasised.

Klaus Kinkel, for his part, expressed satisfaction that Kozyrev began consultations with a visit to Berlin. The German minister emphasised an urgent necessity for all-embracing compliance with sanctions against the union republic of Yugoslavia.

The German foreign minister informed his Russian counterpart of the results of his recent visit to Croatia.

## Churkin on Implementation of Vance-Owen Plan

*LD1705141693 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaliy Churkin, the Russian president's special representative, held a news conference today. Here is Vitaliy Buzuyev with the details:

[Buzuyev] Vitaliy Churkin told us that Andrey Kozyrev is today starting a working tour of foreign countries, during which he will hold intensive consultations on the problem of settling the crisis in former Yugoslavia. He is to meet with German Foreign Minister Kinkel and the leaders of Croatia and Serbia. Then, on 21 May, a scheduled meeting of the UN Security Council is expected to be attended by the foreign ministers of the Security Council member countries, where new decisions on former Yugoslavia will probably be taken.

Russia, Vitaliy Churkin declared, favors consistent implementation of the Vance-Owen plan, despite the fact that, according to provisional figures, the Bosnian Serbs did not support the plan in their referendum. As Vitaliy Churkin commented:

[Begin Churkin recording] The position of the world community in the process of consistently implementing the Vance-Owen plan must be delicate, but firm—firm toward possible violators of the decisions to be made by the international community and possible elements in any of the parties which might attempt to wreck the process of a peace settlement. As part of this approach, we feel that in the event of such incidents—attempts to wreck a peace settlement—the Security Council could consider taking necessary measures, without ruling out any possibilities. [end recording]

[Buzuyev] This means that even the possibility of bombing Bosnian Serb positions is not being ruled out. Admittedly, it is not clear who will determine the blame and responsibility to be attached to those guilty of wrecking the Vance-Owen peace plan, and how it will be done. Overall, however, Vitaliy Churkin is optimistic. Regarding the attitude of the Bosnian Serbs to the Vance-Owen plan, he said, in particular:

[Begin Churkin recording] The Bosnian Serbs themselves will realize in practice that the Vance-Owen plan poses no threat to them. Rather, although it is perhaps, or even probably, not the ideal basis for a peace settlement as far as they are concerned, it is today the only basis on which it is possible to move from a state of war to a state of peace and a worthy life. [end recording]

[Buzuyev] Let us hope these expectations are fulfilled.

## Press Comments on Yugoslav Situation

### Diplomacy Warned of Dangers

*PM1705155993 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 May 93 p 2*

[Sergey Sidorov article: "What the New Balkan Situation Promises"]

[Text] The decision by the Yugoslav leadership this week to stop all aid —apart from humanitarian aid—to the Bosnian Serbs has created a new situation in the Balkan crisis. Many politicians in the West and in Russia probably greeted this news with a sigh of relief. The former will clearly not have to face the question of bombing Bosnian Serb positions, risking the safety of the UN contingent in Bosnia-Herzegovina. For its part, Moscow avoids—at least for a while—the heartrending choice of closing its eyes to Western military intervention against a country with which Russia has long-standing historical ties, or entering into confrontation with the West when it has neither the will nor the economic prerequisites to succeed.

But does this mean that conditions are finally ready for a breakthrough on a Bosnian settlement? Does it mean that Russia has come through the stage of the toughest decisions and that now its government will not have to "battle" the lawmakers to justify its Yugoslav policy? It is highly doubtful. The results of the Serbian referendum held in Bosnia this weekend could put everyone—Belgrade, Moscow, and the Western capitals—in a difficult position once again.

What should be done if the Serbs follow their representatives in rejecting the alien document called the Vance-Owen plan? Observers' forecasts are not very reassuring—it would be a miracle if the Serbs approved it. Fearing a negative result, Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic has come up with an initiative for an "all-Serbian congress" where the question of adoption of the Vance-Owen plan would be discussed not only by deputies from the Bosnian Serb parliament but also by representatives of Serbian Krajina in Croatia and by deputies from the parliaments of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Serbia, and Montenegro.

This is an entirely reasonable step. After all, the question of a peaceful settlement plan actually concerns the vital interests of Yugoslavia and the entire Serbian people. But Milosevic is operating at the limit of his abilities. The, for him, difficult decision to bring in the embargo enraged both the radical and liberal opposition, which accused the ruling regime of "hypocrisy" and "authoritarianism." Those are the feelings of the Serbs in Yugoslavia, not to mention the Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia who have been deprived of the aid. And what if Milosevic—whom the West has persistently painted as virtually a war criminal—suddenly upped and lost power? Would that mean more unpredictability?

As for the West itself, it is already in an awkward spot. For a whole year it has been talking about "Serbian aggression." But with every passing day it is becoming harder and harder to convince the public of the truth of that thesis. The Serbs only had to abide strictly by the cease-fire conditions for a time before the atrocities committed by the Croats against Muslim civilians surfaced.

President Clinton made a sober judgment Tuesday: "...Neither the United States nor the United Nations should participate in the war in Bosnia on anyone's side." But this position does not entirely fit the thesis that there is no alternative to the Vance-Owen plan. Given the fact that it is a multilateral conflict, a civil war, the only fair solution will be an internal one, without outside interference. But direct negotiations between the warring sides have hitherto been rejected, even on the basis of the Vance-Owen plan, as proposed by the Bosnian Serbs. They are rejected both by the West and by Bosnia's Muslim leadership, which senses powerful support from the United States. How can the Muslims avoid direct contacts with the Serbs and then say that they can live with them in the same state?

Even supposing the Vance-Owen plan is actually implemented, this will scarcely give cause for thinking that a lasting settlement has been achieved. The Balkans could suffer the same fate as the Near East. There is no way an outsider can answer the fundamental question: How can the Serbs, Croats, and Muslims go on living together?

Let the heads of Russian diplomacy—who recently hastened to state that the results of the Russian referendum give them carte blanche in all future foreign policy actions—not delude themselves. The Balkan area of our foreign policy is a very delicate one. This applies particularly to the extremely contradictory question of a Russian military contingent's participation in the peacemaking operation in Bosnia in the event of the Bosnian Serbs' consenting to the Vance-Owen plan, which is what the Russian Foreign Ministry is insisting on.

There are at least two questions which have to be clearly answered before such decisions are made. The first concerns finance. As is known, unlike the 20 battalions of "blue helmets" in the former SFRY, which are maintained by the United Nations, the new contingent in Bosnia will be financed by the states that are planning to participate. A simple calculation shows that it would cost around $7 million per month just to pay the contingent of 5,000-7,000 servicemen. If you add to this figure the cost of feeding the personnel, maintaining the equipment, buying fuel and lubricants, and so on, you get a tidy sum. Great though Russia is, it does not have this kind of money at the moment.

The second question is: Who will run the show? The Americans have already staked a claim: Since NATO will form the basis of the peacemaking contingent in Bosnia, NATO structures should be in charge. And as there will be 20,000 U.S. soldiers in it, it will be commanded by an American. This is a long-established practice in NATO: The bloc's political leader can be a representative of any of the countries, but the supreme commander in chief of the allied armed forces is always an American. The United States has never placed its forces under a foreign command.

It was because of U.S. military dominance that France once quit the NATO military organization. For that very reason France is against its forces in Bosnia being commanded by a U.S. general. As a full and permanment member of the Security Council, France is fussy about matters of national sovereignty. Britain does not object to U.S. commanders—it has a special relationship with America. How will Russia act?

So the referendum in Bosnia and the events that follow it could herald a major diplomatic success, but they could also be the start of mistaken and even fatal decisions. What we need more than ever before is realism and responsibility from the politicians, both Serbian and Western—and, of course, Russian.

### Warning on Rushing Into Conflict

*PM1705151793 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 May 93 p 3*

[Sergey Sidorov report: "Russian Foreign Ministry Favors Phased Plan on Bosnia"]

[Text] In the referendum the overwhelming majority of the Bosnian Serbs (roughly 60 percent of those with the right to vote) opposed the so-called Vance-Owen plan. They thus disregarded the insistent recommendations from the Belgrade leadership that they approve the plan and indicated that they will resort to arms in order to resist any attempt to impose it.

Western mass media, which have been sending numerous reports from Bosnia, confirmed the unanimity that prevailed among the Serbs during the vote. The "demise" of the plan was announced at a news conference in Pale by the Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic. He said that the Vance-Owen proposals cannot be implemented in practice once they have been rejected by the people.

General Ratko Mladic, commander of the Serbian army in Bosnia, gave a sharply worded warning against military intervention in Bosnian affairs. "If anybody tries to implement the Vance-Owen plan by force, he will leave his bones here," he said in an interview to a REUTER correspondent.

All the indications are that the split in Belgrade has deepened. Vojislav Seselj, leader of the Serbian Radical Party—the second biggest political party in Yugoslavia in terms of influence—has distanced itself from the position of the presidents of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Serbia and has announced the willingness of his supporters to give effective help to the Bosnian Serbs in the event of outside interference. "The

Serbian side, of course, will suffer big losses," ABC quoted him as saying at a news conference. "But victory will be ours. The Americans will suffer a defeat. It will be a bigger defeat for them than Vietnam. We will fight to the last man."

Meanwhile the Americans are prudently not rushing into Bosnia. The White House has formulated an "amended" plan which proposes withdrawing the UN forces to the Bosnian-Yugoslav border where they would monitor implementation of the terms of the embargo on deliveries of fuel and weapons to the Bosnian Serbs imposed by Belgrade, and in addition the deployment of peacekeeping forces along the border with Albania and the Serbian province of Kosovo. This was reported by NEWSWEEK.

Meanwhile the Russian Foreign Ministry leadership has proposed that the UN Security Council vote in favor of a new resolution authorizing the practical implementation of certain sections of the Vance-Owen plan. One of its authors, along with former Norwegian Foreign Minister Stoltenberg, who has replaced Vance, visited Moscow at the weekend and asked Moscow during talks with Andrey Kozyrev to send 2,000 Russian soldiers to Bosnia. In the opinion of Kozyrev himself, they could benefit the peace process in Bosnia by taking up positions in areas where there are no hostilities. However, military experts still take an adverse view of the idea of stepping up Russian participation in the UN mission in Yugoslavia. Their main arguments are as follows. Russia, already preoccupied with acute conflicts in the former USSR, lacks the money to send soldiers to Bosnia. Moreover, it is a question of an extremely delicate function being performed by a state that has not yet acquired the requisite internal stability and still lacks an integral concept for its policy in the Balkans.

The Vance-Owen plan is obviously coming under heavy pressure. If it is impossible to abandon it in favor of formulating a new plan, then we should at least not rush to enter into confrontation with an entire people.

### 'Shock Assault' Viewed

*PM1605154593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 93 First Edition p 1*

[Nikolay Yermolovich report: "After Referendum in Bosnia Shock Group of Russian Diplomats Flies Urgently to Yugoslavia"]

[Text] The situation in Bosnia has become sharply aggravated. According to the preliminary results of the referendum the overwhelming majority of Bosnian Serbs have rejected the Vance-Owen peace plan. This jeopardizes the large-scale efforts of the entire world community to resolve the Yugoslav conflict.

Regarding the search for a peaceful settlement of the Yugoslav drama as the paramount task, Lord Owen and T. Stoltenberg, the cochairmen of the Coordinating Committee of the London Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, have arrived in Moscow. On 17 May, at the end of talks with them, Russian Foreign Minister A. Kozyrev and Deputy Foreign Minister V. Churkin are setting off on an urgent trip. They will be visiting Yugoslavia and a number of European capitals. The final destination is New York.

The shock assault by Russian diplomacy is in response to B. Yeltsin's instruction to "work toward extinguishing the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina." This is the main point and the paramount task of the world community, Kozyrev stated, which form the basis of the "progressive fulfillment" of the Vance-Owen plan for the settlement of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia.

A few hours before the Russian plane took off not all the points in the program had been agreed on yet. The first stopover is Berlin, where talks will be held with German Foreign Minisater K. Kinkel. Then they will fly on to Split, where there will be a meeting with Croatian President F. Tudjman and A. Izetbegovic, president of the presidency of Bosnia-Herzegovina. There will be an examination of the possibility of their joint departure from there to Mostar, the historic center of Herzegovina, for talks with the leaders of the Croats and Muslims, who are fighting one another. But most likely the leaders of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina will go there alone and Kozyrev will fly to Belgrade.

The Belgrade round of talks will in all probability be confined to meetings with the leadership of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Serbia. Radovan Karadzic's invitation to the Yugoslav capital remains in doubt, since he has recently been persona non grata for Belgrade.

In Rome Kozyrev will attend the meeting of foreign ministers of the Western European Union. And again the Yugoslav topic is on the program.

The trip will conclude at UN headquarters in New York. Russia, which is chairing the Security Council, has proposed that a session of the foreign ministers of the Security Council members be called for Friday to adopt the draft resolution it has elaborated for the execution of the plan for a peaceful settlement of the Bosnian crisis. This decison is supported by the United States and the EC. Russia seized the initiative in the settlement of the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina when its foreign minister, Andrey Kozyrev, advocated the immediate implementation of the Vance-Owen plan without waiting for the results of the Bosnian Serbs' referendum, Western observers note.

This happened Sunday in Moscow after talks with Lord Owen and T. Stoltenberg, cochairmen of the Coordinating Committee of the London Conference on the Former Yugoslavia. Describing their mission as "historic in the search for ways of securing a peaceful settlement of the Yugoslav tragedy," Kozyrev specially noted that the mission "should yield fruit in the very near future."

The head of Russia's foreign policy department believes that the chief result of the effort that has been made in this direction to date is the achievement of international concord over this plan. This was also reflected, in particular, in its approval by the presidents of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Serbia, and Montenegro. "This is why," Kozyrev emphasized, "it is necessary today, regardless of the obstructionist stand of those forces which are interested in war, to begin strictly fulfilling the provisions of the Vance-Owen plan."

Carrying out B. Yeltsin's instructions, the Russian side intends to make its contribution to the "progressive fulfillment" of the plan for a settlement in this region, which, according to the minister's definition, represents a zone of Russia's special responsibility and historical ties.

Lord Owen emphasized that Russia has given and is continuing to give extremely important and effective assistance in seeking a solution to the Yugoslav crisis. "It would not be an exaggeration," he said, "to say that without Russia's assistance the present progress in settling the conflict would not have been made." Stoltenberg in turn remarked that "it would be extremely dangerous today to speak of any changes to the Vance-Owen plan, which has been approved by broad international circles and also by a considerable majority in the states of the former Yugoslavia."

### Serbs Said Divided

*PM1705150993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 93 First Edition p 3*

[Yevgeniy Vostrukhov report: "Belgrade Votes in Favor of Vance-Owen Plan, Bosnia Votes Against"]

[Text] Belgrade—A joint session of five parliaments—the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Serbia, Montenegro, Serbian Krajina, and the Serbian Republic within Bosnia—in Belgrade's Sava Center has ended with a declaration of support for the Vance-Owen peace plan.

The document emphasizes that this plan is the only means of overcoming the crisis proposed by the international cmmunity. It makes it possible to resolve contentious issues by means of talks. The plan envisages a mechanism for the protection and security of Serbs living outside the Serbian provinces in Bosnia, and also does not rule out the possibility of further corrections to the maps of the new provinces.

The Belgrade declaration was adopted unanimously, but only around half the deputies of the five assemblies voted in favor of it. The session in Belgrade was boycotted by the Bosnians and, in a gesture of solidarity with the brothers from Bosnia, by the majority of deputies from Serbian Krajina and by the emissaries of a number of Serbian and Montenegrin democratic and opposition parties.

It looks as though the Vance-Owen peacemaking plan is triggering a split among political parties within the Serbian leadership, which is at long last steering a firm course toward restoring peace in the former Yugoslavia.

As for the referendum, the two-day poll of residents of territories controlled by the Serbian armed forces has gone ahead. Around 900,000 people were supposed to take part in it: No one knows the precise number of voters because of the military operations and general chaos and disolocation. It is reported that the referendum has been held in 84 Serbian communities and over 80 percent of voters have taken part in it. Members of the electoral commissions have also visited the front line, where 95 percent of soldiers and officers voted. Residents of Sarajevo and other settlements braved sniper fire to vote. Probably for the first time in history people have been forced to vote to the thunder of cannon fire and under the barrel of automatic weapons.

Bosnian leaders have no doubts about the results: The courageous Serbian people have said "no" to the anti-Serbian Vance-Owen plan. After the voting R. Karadzic told journalists that the plan is dead and the world is wasting its time by insisting on the existence of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a unified state. The Vance-Owen plan cannot be implemented because it is out of touch with reality. In R. Karadzic's opinion, the world has two possibilities: Either it can agree to the real fact that Serbs and Muslims cannot live together, or the war will continue.

The Bosnian Serb leader called for the elaboration of a new plan with the participation of former USSR President M. Gorbachev and former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who will be able to submit realistic proposals on the basis of their vision of the situation in Bosnia. R. Karadzic particularly pointed to Kissinger's opinion that Bosnia should be divided into three autonomous republics.

### PRAVDA Criticizes German Moves

*PM1805084393 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 93 p 3*

[Yevgeniy Fadeyev report: "Revenge in the Balkans. United Germany Versus Dismembered Yugoslavia"]

[Text] Belgrade—Let me begin with front-page stories from two Belgrade newspapers: "Germans in Sky Over Bosnia" and "Germany in Serbian Danube"....

Some 50 years after being defeated on local battlefields, the Germans are returning once again as a military force.

When Croatia unilaterally withdrew from the SFRY two years ago, its independence was first recognized by Germany—contrary to the deadline set by the EC. That day a song could be heard on the radio in Zagreb from dawn to dusk—"Germany, thanks for everything." The Croatian authorities then banned films depicting Hitlerite atrocities during World War II. With diplomatic

relations having been ceremonially established, old friends from the time of the puppet Independent State of Croatia set up by Hitler immediately started sending military shipments. In just one month of last year German firms, in breach of the UN embargo, illegally dispatched 2,000 Ambrust [as transliterated] missiles, 1,000 Stinger missiles, and 100,000 Kalashnikov assault rifles with 5,000 cartridges each.

In gratitude Croatia promised to give the Germans a concession on developing tourism at the port of Rijeka and the Adriatic resort of Neum in...Bosnia-Herzegovina. The then Foreign Minister Z. Sherapovich [name as transliterated] publicly stated, as if proud of the fact, that he himself would do nothing to solve any major problems without Chancellor Kohl and his colleague Genscher.

"All the Serbs are communists, from the patriarch to the last villager," one of the deputies of Ustashe ringleader Pavelic announced half a century ago during a joint review of German and Croatian troops. The "father of the nation" himself bequeathed his descendants the sadistic formula: "A third of the Serbs should be converted to Catholicism, a third slaughtered, and a third expelled."

When on 7 July 1941 Serbia became the first country in Europe to rise up against the occupiers, Hitler said the following: "We need to prepare to destroy Yugoslavia both militarily and as a state entity. From the political standpoint it is particularly important that the attack be launched with merciless cruelty." The result is well known: In terms of numbers of people killed—almost 2 million—Yugoslavia ranked third after the Soviet Union and Poland.

The only force to oppose the enemies of Serbia has always been Russia. Germany has always tried to crush a strong Slavic state. Now that the Soviet Union has collapsed and Germany has been unified, Yugoslavia has been dismembered. "In the space of a year the Germans have accomplished what Hitler was unable to achieve in 10 years," the magazine EPOKHA concluded gloomily.

I recall a conversation I had two years ago with Academician J. Rashkovich [name as transliterated], leader of the Serbian movement in Croatia:

"Germany is responsible for having made possible the creation of the monstrous fascist state of Croatia. It now wants to turn Croatia into the supervisor of the German people's Adriatic beaches. That's for starters. Then its leaders, along with the masters of the new world order, will start tearing Yugoslavia to pieces. Genscher and Kohl should appear alongside others in the war crimes dock for having destroyed a sovereign state."

At the time, these words seemed to have been said in the heat of argument. But here is what NEW YORK TIMES Europe correspondent D. Binder recently stated on channel one of German TV:

"Two men stand out on the list of war criminals in the Balkans. It was Chancellor Kohl and Foreign Minister Genscher who, by their official recognition of the separatist Yugoslav republics, brought about the war."

This destructive diplomacy is now being continued by K. Kinkel, the new head of the Bonn foreign policy department. Under German influence the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is still not being allowed into the United Nations. Yet Croatia joined this international organization instantly, as did Slovenia and Bosnia.

"References to World War II can no longer be taboo for Germany," the magazine BILD states. "The Serbian artillery positions are well known. We can bomb them day and night."

"Because of our past sins we cannot tolerate genocide if only because the 'Third Reich' exterminated peoples 50 years ago," a Leipzig newspaper writes. Now German Leopard tanks delivered through Croatia are fighting the Bosnian Serbs. And German pilots are among those flying the Airborne Warning And Control System [AWACS] planes penetrating foreign airspace. The U.S. Sixth Fleet ships "flexing their muscles" in Adriatic waters have been joined by the cruiser Rommel.

Germany is also the main organizer of the propaganda "demonization" of Serbia. Hamburg's DIE ZEIT was forced to admit: "Never since World War II has Germany been so united in its hostility toward Serbia. Politicians of both left and right are unanimous that those to blame for the Balkan war are not the Muslims, not the Croats (whose atrocities are little known about in Europe), but exclusively the Serbs. The explanation for the specific German hostility toward Serbia is to be found in their historic confrontation."

What is Germany after today? Revenge for its severe and humiliating defeat during World War II? Access to the Adriatic—something it has dreamed of for hundreds of years? The destruction of Serbia as the last bastion of communism? Yes, that too. And also the transfer of nuclear power station construction from West Europe to the Balkans, and the use of Croatian territory to smuggle uranium and plutonium from the CIS countries.

And what is wrong with the idea of placing the Danube under complete German control, particularly now—following the commissioning of the Danube-Rhine-Main Canal? It finds itself simultaneously closer to the mouth of the river, the Black Sea, and Russia. It is no accident that the German media are increasingly attacking Moscow for its "pro-Serbian syndrome."

### West Said Imposing Plan

*PM1805085593 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 93 pp 1, 3*

[Yevgeniy Fadeyev report: "One Thing Being Asked of Serbs—To Die"]

[Text] Belgrade, 17 May—The result of the Bosnian Serb referendum—"yes" or "no" to the Vance-Owen plan—will be officially known Wednesday [19 May]. But it is already clear that, irrespective of the poll's results (and more than 80 percent of citizens turned out) the plan elaborated abroad is clinically dead.

"We are not saying 'no' to peace, we are saying 'no' to the maps of the former Bosnia-Herzegovina, which treat us as one of the parties to the conflict," Bosnian Serb leader R. Karadzic stated. "We have our own functioning republic. We have the three criteria sufficient for recognition of a state—a population, a territory, and popularly elected authorities. We are in control of our territory, whereas Mr. Izetbegovic holds just half of Sarajevo.... We are ready to talk with the Muslims and the Croats, but only on an equal basis.... If the West really wants peace, it should heed the will of the Serbian people," Karadzic stated.

C. Vance has retired, but the plan for Bosnia (which, incidentally, all observers describe as the least-bad option) lives on. Moreover, the more vigorously it is opposed by the Bosnian Serbs (which is entirely understandable, since they stand to be catastrophic losers in any partition of Bosnia-Herzegovina), the greater the pressure brought to bear by outside forces.... Clearly, it was in the heat of argument—anything but this notorious plan!—that Karadzic suddenly proposed Sunday that former Soviet President M. Gorbachev head a peacekeeping mission to Bosnia. Only in a moment of desperation, a number of local observers concluded, would an invitation to play the part of creator be issued to a man who was essentially a destroyer (having brought down the Berlin Wall, destroyed the USSR, and left a great party to the whim of fate....)

None of the mass media in Belgrade has overlooked the recent foreign policy events in Moscow—the continuing unity between the United States and Russia on the Yugoslav crisis. "Although its existence has never been reported, the gentleman's agreement between the Kremlin and the White House has been working superbly for several months," the newspaper BORBA notes.

And the newspaper VECERNJE NOVOSTI states bluntly that "contrary to the wishes of most Russian people, Kozyrev continues to defend interests that are primarily those of the United States."

In general, the creators of the new political thinking favor the Vance-Owen Plan. But the opinions of those who will reap its results are not taken into account. Thus it seems that the architects of common human values have decided that "only one thing is asked of you Serbs—to die. Everything else is our business."

## Head of Russian UNPROFOR Contingent Interviewed

*LD1705220893 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 2000 GMT 17 May 93*

[Interview with Colonel V. Kostenko, head of the Russian UNPROFOR contingent in the former Yugoslavia, by correspondent Mikhail Aleksandridi; place and date not given—recorded; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] For over a year 36 members of the Russian group of UN police observers have been staying in the former Yugoslavia, monitoring the observance of human rights in the areas of Serbian- Croatian confrontation.

[Aleksandridi] What was the basis for selecting members for the Russian contingent? Has it proved justified?

[Kostenko] First of all, to serve here one has to be fluent in English, to be able to drive in the most difficult conditions, to have some experience in direction finding, and to have served at least five years in the militia.

[Aleksandridi] What can you say about the attitude of the local population to the Russian contingent and their work?

[Kostenko] I would not single out our staff or our work, since we are members of the UN family. The general attitude to UNPROFOR [UN Protection Force], as the UN peacekeeping forces in the former Yugoslavia are known, has been good-natured, because the people are fed up with war, and one can tell this. I would like to note that representatives of all three sides were trying to solve the problems and to restore peace in this long-suffering country. Sometimes these attempts bore fruit.

## Grachev Comments on Issues at News Conference

### Wants Agreement on Bosnia

*LD1705125793 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 17 May 93*

["Excerpt" of news conference by Defense Minister Pavel Grachev on 17 May; place not given—recorded; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Turkey supports the use, supports the possibility of ground troops being used to resolve the internal problems of Bosnia-Hercegovina. That's the first thing. Second, I reiterated that the Bosnia issue has to be resolved by agreement, by way of a peaceful political outcome, by way of talks among all three communities, the Croat, Muslim, and Bosnian Serb, with a degree of involvement by UN organizations.

At the same time, this does not exclude the presence at such talks of other representatives and in the future of observers, including military.

### Views Turkey Visit, Georgia Talks

*LD1705130793 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 17 May 93*

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The Russian defense minister held a news conference today on his visit to Turkey and his meeting with the Georgian defense minister.

According to expert opinion, Grachev is in a difficult position. He has to handle difficult issues concerning Russian military and technical cooperation with other countries while simultaneously sorting out the acute problems of Russian troops in the worst flashpoints of the former Soviet Union.

For example, when he was in Turkey the Russian defense minister visited Turkish forces stationed in the immediate vicinity of Russian troops in Armenia. Military and technical cooperation will be expanded, but the Turks will be contractually forbidden to forward Russian-made weaponry to conflict zones in the former USSR.

With the Georgian defense minister, Grachev discussed ways of preventing attacks on Russian servicemen and the withdrawal of the seismic laboratory and its 30 workers from Abkhazia.

At the same time, the Russian defense minister announced that there can be no question of any withdrawal by the Russian 14th Army from the Dniester Region until it can be carried out in complete safety.

Pavel Grachev flies out to the Baltic states tomorrow.

### Says Azerbaijan Imports Weapons

*LD1705122493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1142 GMT 17 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—Russian Defence Minister Pavel Grachev confirmed at a news conference here on Monday that Azerbaijan imports weapons through third countries.

Replying to ITAR-TASS, the minister noted: "I said in Ankara that, according to our information, some states supply Azerbaijan with arms, materiel and spares. This is a fact. I did not identify these states and shall not do this today".

He stressed at the same time that he had in mind former Soviet republics.

Turning to statements made by the Azeri Defence Ministry and the Azeri presidential press service last week, which attempted to accuse him of dishonesty and support for the Armenian side, Grachev noted: "If Azerbaijan continues to fan up the situation in this respect in future, I shall, may be, identify those states at the next meeting".

"We closely follow the supplies of materiel and arms to Azerbaijan and do not miss a single fact," the minister concluded.

### Wants Azerbaijan To Extradite Servicemen

*LD1705140593 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1300 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Russian Federation Defense Minister Pavel Grachev commented on Russia's positions regarding former Russian servicemen condemned to death in Azerbaijan. He stated to journalists today that the president, the Supreme Soviet chairman, and the Defense Ministry had requested on many occasions that the Azerbaijani leadership extradite the five former Russian servicemen so that they can be put on trial for desertion. However, all the requests had remained unanswered, stated the defense minister.

(?Shaim Rustamov), chairman of the Military Collegium of Azerbaijani Supreme Court, stated that he was categorically opposed to handing over the convicts to Russia. Speaking to newsmen in Baku today he said that their guilt was proved in court and therefore the criminals must be answerable before the law. (Rustamov) said that there were no political implications in the case, and that the sentence was passed only for the unlawful actions which were committed.

### Talks on Nagorno-Karabakh Reportedly End in Failure

*NC1705130393 Paris AFP in English 1247 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Moscow, May 17 (AFP)—Peace talks on resolving the conflict between Armenians and Azeris over the Nagorno-Karabakh enclave ended in failure here Monday [17 May], according to an Armenian source.

"The parties left without achieving any results but negotiations are continuing," said a representative of the Armenian delegation involved in the talks which began Friday.

A Russian Foreign Ministry official said an official statement on the matter would be issued Tuesday.

The meeting in Moscow was attended by Russian, Turkish and U.S. envoys who were reviewing their nations' peace plan for ending the five-year conflict. The plan calls for a two-month freeze on all military activity once Armenian forces begin pulling out from the Kelbadzharskiy region in Azerbaijan, which they occupied last month.

Armenia has stalled on outright acceptance of the plan, asking for additional guarantees for a ceasefire and for the placement of foreign observers by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

More than 7,000 people have been reportedly killed in the fighting which erupted after residents of Nagorno-Karabakh, 80 percent of them Christian Armenians, voted in a referendum at the end of 1991 to become independent of Muslim Azerbaijan.

### Condemned Soldiers in Azerbaijan May Be Swapped for Arms

*LD1605214193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1800 GMT 16 May 93*

[From the "Itogi" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted on death sentence imposed by Azerbaijani court on five Russian servicemen] We have learned at the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs that its embassy in Baku is currently taking steps to have the sentenced servicemen handed over to the Russian legal bodies. However, KHABAR-SERVIS, the independent Azerbaijani news agency, has reported, citing sources at the Azerbaijani Justice Ministry, that in practice there are no chances of this taking place. There is only a possibility of substituting the death penalty with a long term of imprisonment.

Incidentally, the same agency—KHABAR-SERVIS—reports from Baku, citing sources at the republican Procuracy, that it is quite possible that the sentenced servicemen will be exchanged for Russian weapons, as once happened when a Russian officer—Senior Lieutenant Lukin—received the death penalty.

### Rutskoy Urges Pardon

*LD1705144993 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1400 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy today sent a letter to Azerbaijani President Abulfaz Elchibey requesting a pardon for the five former Russian army servicemen sentenced to death a few days ago.

The cable says: It is not only the lives of Yaroslav Yevstigneyev, Vyacheslav Kudinov, Konstantin Tukin, Andrey Filippov, and Mikhail Lisovoy, and the hearts of their mothers and fathers that depend on your decision, but relations between Russia and Azerbaijan overall, the history of which is only just beginning. However great the guilt of those Russian soldiers, does it deserve to become forever a black landmark on the road which our peoples are taking together toward freedom, democracy, and cooperation, the cable stresses.

### Kuzbass Demands Handover

*LD1705105393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 17 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo, 17 May—Unless the Russian soldiers sentenced to death in Azerbaijan are handed over to the Russian law enforcement agencies, there can be no question of guaranteeing deliveries of Kuzbass goods to Azerbaijan. This is stated in a telegram Kemerovo Oblast Soviet Chairman Aman Tuleyev sent today to Azerbaijan's leader Abdulfaz Elchibey.

Tuleyev believes "responsibility for the acts of the Russian lads rests primarily with the politicians who put them up to it [podstavit] by placing weapons in their hands, and that therefore the death sentence must not be carried out". At the same time, Tuleyev sought support on the issue from the chairmen of the soviets of the krays and oblasts which are members of the "Siberian Agreement".

### Yeltsin Cited on Talks With Shevardnadze

*LD1405154293 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1300 GMT 14 May 93*

[Text] After face-to-face meetings, the members of the delegations at the talks in Moscow had a plenary talk in which their leaders, Eduard Shevardnadze and Boris Yeltsin, took part.

We have come to an agreement in principle. These were the first words the Russian president said just after the talks had finished. He declared: Now, the major issue is a cease-fire in Abkhazia. We have to do our best to stop the bloodshed. We have outlined terms on this issue. First, there will be a cease-fire and in the middle of June the withdrawal of heavy equipment from the conflict area will begin. It is necessary that the bombardment of towns and other populated areas by airplanes and helicopters be stopped so that there are no longer discussions on who is doing the bombing and so on. This, naturally, has caused concern. We have agreed that Eduard Shevardnadze and I will have personal representatives in Abkhazia.

Boris Yeltsin went on to say: I have told Eduard Shevardnadze that our stance remains unchanged—we support Georgia's integrity. But the Abkhazians are also supposed to feel that their rights are respected. Here we have to think of the demarcation of functions. If this process develops successfully we will probably sign a comprehensive agreement between the Republic of Georgia and the Russian Federation in mid-June. Yeltsin added: During our conversation we also discussed a number of economic issues. The Russian president thanked Georgia for supporting him during the referendum. He said that after its successful completion we can act more vigorously.

### Shokhin Comments on Possibility of Economic Union

*LD1805095693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0857 GMT 18 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 18 May—"An economic alliance of CIS member-states should be formed in a way profitable to Russia," stated Russian Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandr Shokhin at a news conference today, referring to results of last Friday's meeting of heads of CIS member-states.

"Many states have come up with the initiative to set up an economic alliance because they realize that independent economic life is costing them a lot. Many would like to see this economic alliance primarily as a customs alliance where Russia would abolish tax on exports of fuel. We believe, however, that when all is said and done, Russia will benefit from moving toward an economic alliance. But in this process, Russia will be observing rather rigorous criteria as far as joining the alliance is concerned," Aleksandr Shokhin underlined.

The Russian deputy prime minister pointed out that the Russian side "is already trying to make it clear to all CIS member-states that an economic alliance would be tantamount to a partial loss of sovereignty, political as well as economic." "It appears that so far everyone is willing to gain advantages from the economic alliance while preserving full political sovereignty. This won't work. When the states get this message, they will come to the understanding that we have a long way to go to achieve an economic alliance," he underlined.

### Further Reaction to U.S. Decision on Abandoning SDI

#### Step in Right Direction

*LD1705134193 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 17 May 93*

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] A step in the right direction—that is how the Russian Foreign Ministry has assessed the decision of the U.S. Administration to abandon the development and deployment in space of antimissile defense systems. This commentary is by our observer Yuriy Solton:

For the past 10 years, work has been going on the program known as the Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI, or the Star Wars program, as Senator Edward Kennedy called it. The then president, Ronald Reagan, proposed creating the space antimissile shield over the United States in March of 1983. Incidentally, he has now become one of the few critics of the announcement by the Clinton administration.

The United States has spent $30 billion on implementing the program. It is not known how much the former Soviet Union had spent on countermeasures, dissimilar ones, as was said, but adequate. It can be safely assumed that it was large. But the main thing is that the SDI and the anti-SDI programs, although technical problems could not be totally solved, threatened to carry the arms race to outer space and built up tension in the relations between the two superpowers.

After the breakup of the USSR, when its successor, Russia, turned to relations of partnership with the United States, the Star Wars program became an anachronism. As the Russian Foreign Ministry has stressed in a statement, it is surely a welcome move that the United States has actually given up these space armaments, which are the most destabilizing element of the Star Wars program. The decision of the Washington administration indicates the growth in confidence in the Russian-American relations, which were promoted again after a recent summit in Vancouver between Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton.

Another contributing factor was the signing of a Russian-American treaty to reduce by two-thirds the strategic nuclear forces of the two countries, which actually reduces the danger of a nuclear conflict between them.

But still, the request of the administration to the U.S. Congress remains in force about setting aside $3.8 billion in the coming fiscal year, from October, to deploying antimissile defense systems known as ABM systems. There are plans to develop a defense system against short-range ballistic missiles and at the second stage to develop a ground-based system of defense on the territory of the United States against intercontinental ballistic missiles. In the latter case, the 1972 ABM Treaty will be affected. This treaty allows the United States and Russia to have only one area of such defense, with a radius of 150 km where no more than 100 antimissiles should deployed. The Russian Foreign Ministry has reaffirmed Moscow's compliance with the ABM Treaty.

In this regard there is one important point. Last summer Russia and the United States agreed at top level to set up a global system of defense against ballistic missiles. Work is already under way amongst groups of experts, including the involvement of other countries. Action on such a program would create not only for Russia and the United States but for other countries, too, reliable protection against accidental, nonendorsed, or terrorist launches of nuclear missiles. Anyway, positive changes are taking place in maintaining and strengthening strategic stability with the emphasis not on the arms race but on cutting arms and creating collective defense systems.

#### START II Played Decisive Role

*PM1805100593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 93 First Edition p 1*

[Vladimir Mikheyev report: "U.S. Defense Secretary Announces Death of 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Les Aspin has declared that the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), better known as the "Star Wars" program, is defunct. The U.S.

Administration has officially renounced plans to create and launch into space ABM defense systems based on a new generation of laser weapons and direct energy beam weapons.

Our still-memorable accusations against the United States regarding attempts to "take the arms race into space" and effect the "militarization of near-earth space" are being consigned to the archives once and for all. The need for warnings from Moscow that a response to the challenge of SDI would be forthcoming and that countermeasures—"appropriate" rather than "similar"—would be taken is diminishing. The reason for SDI's premature aging, as the Pentagon head affirms, is the "collapse of the Soviet Union."

If history demonstrates graphically that the SDI project forced the Soviet leadership to enter into talks to reduce nuclear arsenals and accelerated the "downfall of the Communist system," the $30 billion spent on realizing "Star Wars" plans will prove to have been "a worthwhile capital investment by American taxpayers." Les Aspin stated as much at a Pentagon press conference.

Although a requiem can be ordered for SDI, the project is fated to live on after death: For fiscal 1994 the Clinton administration is continuing to request $3.8 billion to develop more sophisticated ABM systems. Given that Washington no longer fears a full-scale surprise attack from the USSR, which no longer exists as such, the primary vector of "external threat" now becomes "hostile states, or states behaving irrationally" and capable of assuming the role of the "nuclear terrorist."

To this end, efforts within the SDI framework are being switched to creating a more advanced technology for protection against short-range ballistic missiles, as well as ground-based systems for defending U.S. territories against ICBM's. So, in the words of the head of the U.S. military department, "an equally extensive but less expensive ground-based ABM defense project" will emerge in place of SDI. Direct savings in the military budget will come to $2.5 billion.

The fate of the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems remains a major reservation in this context. It will not apply to new types of protection against short-range ballistic missiles (or theater weapons). But if, to cite L. Aspin, the United States "moves on to the next stage—that is, setting up defenses for the continental United States against ICBM attack by terrorist states," then it will be necessary to decide the future of the ABM Treaty somehow. The U.S. defense secretary suggests that in this case what will be required will be to introduce "certain amendments" to it, in consultation with Russia, of course.

What does Moscow think of the SDI obituary notice published in Washington? Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Grigoriy Vitalyevich Berdennikov expressed his view as a preliminary step (an official Foreign Ministry statement is expected once all the details have been studied.)

"SDI has long been an anachronism which belonged to the era of confrontation, and not at all part of the new conditions of partnership between the United States and Russia. I believe that a decisive role in the abandonment of SDI was played by the still-unratified Treaty on the Reduction of Strategic Offensive Arms, START II, which is yielding its first fruits."

In the deputy foreign minister's view, a significant reduction in nuclear arsenals increases the stabilizing role of the ABM Treaty, which has not lost its usefulness, and for this reason Moscow will insist on compliance with it.

So the technotronic "Star Wars" fantasy will remain only on paper, and on the shelf, what is more. Reacting to this event, America's CBS television company summed it up: "Today, the Pentagon too has started to walk in step with history."

## Commentary on U.S. Moves To Resume Nuclear Testing

*LD1705213993 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 17 May 93*

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] Top administration officials met in Washington on Friday to draw up recommendations for President Clinton in respect to the moratorium on nuclear testing that expires on 1st July. Commentary by Vladislav Kozyakov:

The question is one of implementing the congressional law endorsed by President Bush last October. It provides for a moratorium on nuclear tests until 1st July 1993, to be followed by as many as 15 nuclear tests until 30th September 1996. At the same time, the White House is instructed to submit to Congress a schedule of talks with Russia on ending nuclear explosions and a plan for a comprehensive nuclear test ban. And finally, the law provides for no U.S. testing after 30th September 1996 provided no other state holds them beyond that date.

It would seem not only did later events reaffirm how important the U.S. law was, but also raised a number of questions relating to the need for more vigorous actions to achieve a comprehensive nuclear test ban. In retrospect, Russia and the United States signed the START II agreement to slash each other's nuclear weapons by two-thirds while relations between Moscow and Washington were put on the footing of those between two good neighbors and partners. They had also agreed to consult other nuclear states about the need for multilateral talks on a comprehensive test ban.

Against this backdrop, reports from Washington spoke of a number of U.S. politicians discussing various options which are totally out of line with the spirit of the times. Although the White House declined to comment on Friday's meeting of top administration officials working out recommendations for the U.S. President,

correspondents say not only was the question of lifting the test ban after 1st July discussed but also the possibility of continuing 1 kiloton tests beyond 1996. The likelihood of resuming tests had been mooted in the U.S. press even before the Friday meeting, causing leading U.S. Congressmen, including the Senate majority leader George Mitchell, to send a letter of protest to Mr. Clinton over the idea of continued testing beyond 1996.

Clearly, the problem of a comprehensive test ban will be complicated if the U.S. resumes nuclear explosions after 1st July, let alone continues them until 1996. Both Moscow and Paris have repeatedly warned they will have to review their own moratoriums if the United States goes ahead with the resumption of tests. It isn't hard to conceive how fatal the U.S. decision can be to the international effort to try and prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, which is an overriding priority for the international community at present.

### Shumeyko Visits U.S., Views Constitutional Process

*LD1805082293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0739 GMT 18 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Igor Barsukov]

[Text] Washington May 18 TASS—Seeking the adoption of a new constitution of the Russian Federation, President Boris Yeltsin and members of his "team" intend to use only legitimate methods, First Vice-Premier Vladimir Shumeyko told a press conference in the National Press Club here on Monday [17 May].

The Congress of People's Deputies continuously works to consolidate the absolute power of the councils and it does not need a new constitution, Shumeyko said. The main issue in Russia now is who will adopt a new fundamental law. The recent referendum reaffirmed the legitimacy of power only for the president. So, in the work on a new constitution, he relies on the leaders of the republics that are part of Russia, who were also popularly elected, and on territorial and regional chiefs.

The president's reliance on the chiefs of the subjects of the federation "will make it possible, in my view, to avoid a civil war, which Khasbulatov frightens people with all the time", Shumeyko said. But the presidential administration will do its best "to conduct all the processes in the russian federation without weapons and without bloodshed." "This is the most important goal of ours," the first vice-premier emphasised.

Shumeyko's opinion is that "only one compromise" can be reached with the Russian Congress of People's Deputies. After a new constitution is adopted clause-by-clause at a constitutional assembly, the congress could then adopt it as a whole, thereby as if "sanctifying" it. This would be a "legal compromise. A legal one only". The administration of the president of Russia would not agree with a Constitutional Court decision if it recognises as illegitimate the president's actions in connection with a procedure for the adoption of a new constitution. In that case "the only way out of the deadlock would be for us again to hold a countrywide referendum," the first vice-premier said.

Shumeyko said that while in the U.S. capital he would meet with high officials of the U.S. Administration and Congress. The broadest spectrum of matters is expected to be discussed, Shumeyko told ITAR-TASS. These are economic issues, the forthcoming group- of-seven summit in Tokyo, political problems in Russia and the influence of U.S. policy on them, Shumeyko said.

In response to a question about prospects for Yeltsin's visit to Japan, Shumeyko said the point now is for the president of Russia to visit Tokyo during the G-7 summit. Then an opportunity will also arise for a meeting with the Japanese prime minister to resolve some issues. As far as the Russian president's visit to Japan is concerned, it is tentatively planned for September this year.

Asked to comment on reports about an outflow of nuclear materials from Russia, Shumeyko said such cases for some reasons are associated with Russia every time although the Soviet Union broke up into a number of sovereign states. Russia itself "is fully in control of the state of affairs" in this respect, he pointed out.

### Polish Deputy Premier Meets Chernomyrdin, Shokhin

*AU1805084293 Warsaw PAP in English 2043 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Moscow, May 17—Deputy Prime Minister Henryk Goryszewski, now in Moscow to prepare the Walesa-Yeltsin meeting in Poland, on Monday [17 May] met with Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin and held the first round of economic talks with Deputy Prime Minister Aleksander Shokhin.

Following the talks, Shokhin said that Boris Yeltsin "wishes to visit Poland after his meeting with the G-7 group of the most industrialized countries in Tokyo." "We have agreed with Mr. Goryszewski that the exact date of President Yeltsin's visit to Poland will be fixed via diplomatic channels shortly after the summit in Tokyo," Shokhin said.

According to presidential sources, Yeltsin's visit to Poland is most likely to take place in September.

Both deputy prime ministers reached an agreement on the signing of commercial-economic and legal protection agreements. The documents along with intergovernmental agreements on cooperation in environmental protection, science and technology and customs policy are due to be signed during President Yeltsin's visit in Warsaw.

The documents to be signed will also include agreements on the status of cemeteries in both countries and the terms of navigation in the Vislinskiy Zaliv, put forward by the Polish side.

Both sides expressed satisfaction that their talks went over debt issues (eight billion roubles on each of the sides inherited from relations with the former Soviet Union) and concentrated on joint economic projects.

Goryszewski's talks with Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin concentrated on a number of economic projects including the construction of a gas pipeline across Polish territory, allowing Russia to pump gas to Western Europe and the Russian region of Kaliningrad on the Baltic sea.

The sides also discussed issues related to trade exchange between both countries, which has been seriously hampered recently, as Goryszewski put it. A Polish-Russian commission was set up to examine the possibilities of restoring the trade exchange to its previous level.

According to Goryszewski, industrial cooperation proposed by the Russian prime minister may turn to be one of the most promising solutions in achieving the animation of trade exchange between Poland and Russia.

### Talks Conclude

*LD1805090293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0736 GMT 18 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 18 TASS—Two-day negotiations between Russian Deputy Premier Aleksandr Shokhin and his Polish counterpart Henryk Goryszewski were concluded on Tuesday. The negotiations culminated in the signing of a protocol listing bilateral agreements between the Russian and Polish Governments to be formulated in two months ahead. The agreement will be signed when Boris Yeltsin visits Poland, the Russian deputy premier told reporters upon the conclusion on the talks.

The package consists of some 20 documents comprising various areas, for instance, an agreement on legal protection, a commercial and economic treaty, an agreement on social protection.

Shokhin said the date of Yeltsin's visit to Poland will be fixed after the Tokyo meeting of the Group of Seven with Russia's participation.

Financial matters were discussed during the Russo-Polish negotiations on tuesday. The Russian side set out another approach. It proposed to use the scheme of the Paris Club not in a strictly juridical sense but as a basis for negotiations to arrive at something like a zero option that would suit both sides in settling mutual debt, Shokhin said.

Goryszewski said this proposal of the Russian side is important. At the same time, he noted that a political solution is needed for the settlement of the problem of debt.

### Western Group of Forces Commander Discusses Withdrawal

*PM1705163393 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1445 GMT 7 May 93*

[Interview with Matvey Prokopyevich Burlakov, commander of the Western Group of Forces by Yuriy Krauze; place and date not given—recorded; fromt he "Man and Law" program]

[Text] [Krauze] Matvey Prokopyevich, how are the Russian-German agreements on the withdrawal of forces being implemented today? Are they being strictly complied with, or are there problems?

[Burlakov] I can tell you that, on our side, all the treaty obligations are being strictly met. We are implementing 100 percent the schedule for the preparations and the actual withdrawal of our forces from Germany to the territory of the Russian Federation and other CIS countries. I believe that there are no particular complaints against us from the German side. Whenever I am interviewed by German journalists, they always ask: How do you manage to implement your treaty obligations as regards the withdrawal so efficiently?

[Krauze] We are slowly getting used to the idea that our troops are withdrawing from other countries. You have already overseen the withdrawal from Hungary. Germany is the second country for you in this respect. At the same time, it seems to me that all sorts of unexpected things are cropping up—am I right?

[Burlakov] Yes indeed.

[Krauze] What is worrying you most in this respect?

[Burlakov] Well, first there are the amenities. Second, we were hoping to sell the fixed capital which we have created over the past 47 years. We drew up an estimate based on 1990 German prices, in line with German standards and in accordance with German methods, and we arrived at 10.5 billion [currency not specified]. If we got these 10.5 billion, we could build a lot of housing. We are leaving behind 21,111 buildings and installations.

[Krauze] We have built a lot of things here, haven't we?

[Burlakov] Of course, we have built airfields, vast depots and bases, huge garrisons—more than 20,000 apartments. But the main problem is that we have not received these billions. Instead we only received 550 million.

[Krauze] Excuse me, but whose fault is this? Is this due to miscalculations by our diplomats?

[Burlakov] I do not know what mechanism was used for these calculations. Perhaps the money was used to repay existing debts—Union debts, perhaps, to the GDR and the FRG. Maybe the money was used for this. I have no information about this mechanism. No one has told me.

[Krauze] Whenever troops are withdrawn from somewhere, this usually causes concern all around, both in the country from which troops are being withdrawn and among those who are leaving. However, this troop withdrawal is also, how can I put it, a nonstandard situation. Do you not feel that you are retreating?

[Burlakov] You know, we have come to terms with the fact that we are going home. Naturally, initially, after 47 years here, the withdrawal was not viewed as a cause for joy—it came very suddenly. Now we have assessed the situation and come to terms with it. Indeed, I believe that armies should be deployed only within the territory of the state to which they belong. I believe that the Americans should also withdraw from Europe and go home. They are planning to leave around 100,000 men behind, but they are withdrawing from Germany, just like the French and the British. To date some 158 battalions have left, of which some 125 battalions were American. We also keep an eye on this. But they are leaving troops behind; we are withdrawing completely.

[Krauze] And you, as a military man, you view this with complete equanimity now?

[Burlakov] Yes, complete equanimity. We are going home.

## Exchange of Workers with Germany Agreed

*LD1705230593 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 17 May 93*

[Report by correspondent S. Vozianov; from the "Vesti newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A year and a half ago, leaders of Germany and Russia came to agreement on an exchange of workers. The idea was to enhance skills of both our compatriots going to Germany for temporary work, and of those being able to observe quality German work in Russia. Today saw the signing of the appropriate agreement.

[Vozianov] In Moscow today, the agreement was signed between the Governments of Russia and Germany on the exchange of workers. Now 2,000 Russian workers from various sectors of production can legally go for a year or a year and a half to Germany to enhance their vocational standards and indeed their standard of living, for under the contract, they will receive German pay. Germany may also send its workers to Russia if there are any willing; their work will be paid for at our rates.

At a brief news conference, Russian Labor Minister Melikyan said that an enterprise could be asked to field candidates for the trip. He added that the project did not need any special state finance. However, German Ambassador in Moscow Mr. Blech said in anticipation of the journalists' question, that the Russians would be used not as unskilled laborers but according to their specialities.

## Spy Who Fled Sweden Said To Pick Up Fee From Moscow

*PM1705135593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 May 93 First Edition p 7*

[Marat Zubko report: "Fugitive Spy Arrives in Moscow for Fee"]

[Text] Stockholm—The third report on Swedish television's channel four was the most sensational: Swede Stig Berling (Yevgeniy Sandberg), a former Soviet spy who in 1987 fled Sweden, where he had been sentenced to life imprisonment, recently arrived in Moscow and there received $100,000-150,000 for services rendered.

Stunning news, it cannot be denied! Is it true?

Let me remind you that for two days in a row IZVESTIYA has informed readers about Swedish television's TV-4, which, when repeating the story of Swedish citizen Stig Berling (the SAPO security service spent around six years hunting him, believing that all this time he was at first in the USSR, then in Russia), stated that according to its information the fugitive spy has been living in Vienna since 1991, that he has had plastic surgery, and that he now has not only a false identity but also the false passport of a Finnish citizen.

On Wednesday [12 May] evening TV-4 served up the latest portion of "hot news" to television viewers. It transpires that Berling had already ventured out of his Vienna asylum. This was in April 1992, when he paid a call on Moscow.

At approximately the same time Russian foreign intelligence chief Ye. Primakov arrived in Sweden and met with Swedish Prime Minister C. Bildt and police chief B. Eriksson. He assured his interlocutors, TV-4 claims, that Berling is not in Russia.

It cannot be ruled out, the author of the broadcast believes, that Primakov was not aware of all the details, because Berling was possibly working for another department. Whether he was or not, according to TV-4 the fugitive spy paid another call on Moscow, where he discussed with his former colleagues plans for his future life. This was in April 1993.

These discussions centered on whether he should stay in Vienna or move to some other country—Latin America, for instance. It was in Moscow, the broadcast said, that Berling received a false passport and the dollars.

## Nakasone Regrets Yeltsin Visit Postponement

*LD1705153893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1527 GMT 17 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Aleksandr Smelyakov]

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—Former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone expressed deep regrets in

connection with the delay of Russian President Yeltsin's visit to his country, because it meant a postponement in Russo-Japanese dialogue on territorial issues.

Nakasone addressed Russian journalists after he was conferred an honorary doctor's diploma at the institute of Far-Eastern studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Touching upon Russo-Japanese relations, Nakasone noted that they were aggravated by the territorial problem.

According to him, one might look for ways of solving the problem both on bilateral and on international levels. Japan would persist in drawing world community's attention to the problem.

It would take certain time for the parties concerned to realize that there were normal, democratic regimes in both the countries, which were capable of holding fruitful negotiations, he said.

For the negotiations to be a success, a stable situation in the world and within the countries concerned was necessary, he emphasized.

Nakasone expressed hope that Boris Yeltsin's visit would finally take place, which would undoubtedly encourage further development of Russo-Japanese relations to the benefit of the two nations.

### Embassy in Japan Denies Reversion to Old Policies

*LD1805092693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0847 GMT 18 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vasily Golovnin]

[Text] Tokyo May 18 TASS—The Russian Embassy in Japan on Tuesday [18 May] officially denied Japanese press reports that the leadership of the Russian Federation ostensibly approved a certain "official document" on foreign policy matters, the document which denies the existence of a territorial issue in relations between the two countries.

In view of the reports, assertions appeared in the Tokyo press recently about Moscow's reversion to the "principles of Brezhnevite diplomacy". At the same time Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa during one of his meetings with reporters questioned the reliability of such reports.

A Russian Embassy press release, made available to ITAR-TASS bureau in Tokyo on Tuesday, has it that reports about an ostensible change in Russia's approach to matters concerning relations with Japan and, specifically, a revision of its stand on the problem of territorial delimitation between the two countries are totally unfounded.

The speculation that any of the theses of Brezhnvite diplomacy can be reanimated in Russia's foreign policy is nonsensical and is not true, the press release pointed out.

Russia has always regarded the development of relations with Japan as a priority, and firmly comes out in favour of giving the character of genuine partnership to these relations, has proceeded and continues to proceed from the need to settle all problems that are a legacy of the cold war, including territorial delimitation problems, on the basis of the principles of legality and justice, with due regard for the entire spectrum of political, social and other circumstances, the press release said.

### Vietnamese Envoy Calls on Khasbulatov

*PM1805091193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 May 93 First Edition p 1*

[Report from ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA/ITAR-TASS column: "Meeting With Vietnamese Ambassador"]

[Text] Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov has met with Ho Huan Nghiem, SRV ambassador to Russia.

The ambassador passed on an invitation from the chairman of Vietnam's National Assembly for a Russian parliamentary delegation to visit the country. He said that the head of Vietnam's parliament has accepted his Russian counterpart's invitation to visit Russia this year.

The meeting's participants noted with satisfaction the "recent increased dynamism in the development of relations between the two countries," including in the sphere of interparliamentary relations.

### Delegation Head Comments on Talks in Havana

*LD1805082593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0554 GMT 18 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Sereda]

[Text] Havana May 18 TASS—Officials from Cuba and the Russian Federation have begun the first round of bilateral talks in Havana on Monday [17 May]. The talks are aimed at assessing bilateral economic contacts and discussing prospects for their development. The Russian delegation to the talks is led by Chairman of the Russian Committee for Chemical and Oil Industry Viktor Ivanov, and the Cuban delegation is led by chairman of the Cuban Council of Ministers, Lionel Soto.

The Cuban national information agency reported that during the talks both sides have confirmed that it was necessary to determine new forms of economic cooperation based on mutually advantageous relations.

The head of the Russian delegation told journalists that his task is to make final preparations for the visit to Cuba by a Russian delegation led by deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Shumeyko.

Last November, talks between Russian and Cuban Government delegations were held in Moscow. The participants in the talks expressed their intention to develop contacts on a new basis relying on principles of sovereignty, equality, self-determination, non-interference in internal affairs, mutual advantage and with regard to mutual interests.

As a result of the talks, intergovernment agreements on trade and economic cooperation, shipment of goods and a protocol on commodity exchange and payments for 1993 were signed.

At present, trade contacts between Cuba and the Russian Federation are, in fact, confined to shipments of Russian oil to Cuba in exchange for Cuban sugar.

## Political Issues

### Yeltsin Meets With Democratic Representatives 17 May

#### Committee Issues Statement

*LD1705165993 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1500 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] The results of the 25 April referendum demonstrated beyond doubt that the citizens of Russia support Boris Yeltsin and the present policy of reforms, says a statement issued today by the Public Committee of Democratic Organizations of Russia. Since the referendum, however—the document points out—the Supreme Soviet leadership has continued to act toward confrontation with the president and the executive power, thereby disregarding the will of the people. Nevertheless, as recent events have shown, there are forces in parliament that are ready for constructive work. Democratic circles have welcomed the sensible position which has found expression in support for the constitutional conference convened by presidential decree, and for the suggestion to include the congress's Constitutional Committee in this.

#### Yeltsin Draft Should Be 'Basis'

*LD1705165793 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1600 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] The Russian president has said that it is possible to include some elements of the draft constitution drawn up by the Constitutional Commission into his draft Basic Law. The presidential draft, however, should be regarded as a basis, Boris Yeltsin stressed at a meeting with representatives of the Public Committee of Russian democratic organizations on 17 May.

The president noted that the leadership of the Supreme Soviet seems to be split on the issue of adopting a new constitution. The fact that the majority of the parliamentary leadership supports the idea of convening a Constitutional Assembly on 5 June is, for instance, evidence of that. If we win on the issue of the constitution, this will be a complete victory, Boris Yeltsin said.

#### Yeltsin Cited on Constitution

*LD1705183893 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 17 May 93*

[Report by correspondent Vadim Perfilyev including recorded remarks by President Boris Yeltsin; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Perfilyev] President Boris Yeltsin met representatives of the Public Committee of Russian Federation Democratic Organizations in the Kremlin today. He congratulated all supporters of the democratic movement on the victory in the referendum and thanked them for upholding the stance of the president and the government.

In the course of the conversation, participants discussed in depth the work on the new constitution.

[Yeltsin] Completing work on the new constitution has advanced to the forefront of Russia's public life. This is the main thing now, and voices have been raised that president should act more decisively. This does not mean, however, that the president should brandish his sword. No, this means that work should be carried out in a sustained manner, and primarily work on the constitution. For if we win with our new constitution, the presidential constitution, this will be the real victory, as they say.

[Perfilyev] The president spoke in favor of making use of positive aspects of the draft prepared by the Constitutional Commission. He also maintained that a certain split has been traced in the Supreme Soviet leadership over the issue of the new constitution. According to the president, the majority of the Supreme Soviet leaders support the proposal to convene the Constitutional meeting or Constitutional Assembly which is due to start on 5 June.

The president stated that issues relating to drafting the new constitution would be discussed at a sitting of the Council of Heads of Russian Federation Republics which is planned for 26 May.

#### New Constitution Will Be 'Full Victory'

*LD1705193293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1905 GMT 17 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—"Now the completion of the work on the new constitution has come to the foreground," Russian President Boris Yeltsin said at a meeting with representatives of the Democratic Forces' Public Committee in the Kremlin on Monday [17 May].

"When they say the president must act more resolutely, this does not mean to brandish a saber. This means to carry out work in a systematic way, and first of all on the constitution. If we win with the new constitution, this will be a full victory," the Russian president stressed.

"It is not necessary to have a fight with the Supreme Soviet," Boris Yeltsin noted. But together with those clauses of the draft drawn by the Constitutional Commission, which have already been used in a new draft of the fundamental law, we should take something else from that draft. However, according to Boris Yeltsin, the basic draft must be that of the president which he proposed to call an alternative draft "so as not to irritate the centrist forces". This alternative draft, supplemented with provisions from the draft proposed by the Constitutional Commission, will be submitted for the final consideration by the Constitutional Assembly due to be held on June 5.

The Russian president believes that this assembly "must be an elective body, or partly elective and partly

appointed—two representatives from 88 subjects of the Russian Federation each, and approximately the same number of representatives from political parties and movements—altogether 350 people."

"This assembly should end its work by initialing the draft constitution by each subject of the Federation," Boris Yeltsin pointed out.

### Democrats Abolishing 'Anti-Market Structures'

*LD1705221093 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 2000 GMT 17 May 93*

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Excerpt] Representatives of the public committee of Russia's democratic organizations had a meeting with President Yeltsin in Kremlin today. Representatives of the committee believe that the government has lately allowed certain deviations from the policy of reform. They are calling for the abolition of such—in their view—anti-market structures as committees for prices and for trade. They are also trying to persuade the president that new reshuffles in the government are necessary, and that the head of the Central Bank has to be replaced. [passage omitted]

### Defense Ministry Not Against Yeltsin Constitution

*LD1705125493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1229 GMT 17 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow May 17 TASS—Russian Defence Minister Pavel Grachev refuted on Monday [17 May] allegations by some mass media that the Defence Ministry opposes the presidential draft of a future constitution.

He told journalists at a news conference that, on instructions from the president, "all departments are now studying the draft and are to submit their proposals and remarks to the document by May 20".

A letter compiled by the Defence Ministry reads that the draft "objectively reflects changes taking place in Russia. It is a reliable legal basis for democratic reforms being realised in the state.

"The draft adequately takes into account defence issues. It is expedient at the same time to have a separate chapter in the constitution devoted to this theme to be called defence of homeland.

In the opinion of the Defence Ministry, this chapter should read that "the defence of the homeland is among the most important functions of the state and a duty of all the citizens of the Russian Federation".

In addition, a legal provision should be made for the state's responsibility for "the country's security and defences and the supply of the armed forces of the Russian Federation with all necessary things".

The letter suggests that an addendum should be made to an appropriate article governing presidential powers, saying that "the president gives orders to the armed forces to repulse aggression" if an act of aggression is committed against Russia.

The document drafted by the ministry contains some other amendments and addenda. However, there are no grounds to say that the military oppose the presidential draft of the fundamental law, Grachev stressed.

### Grachev Outlines Military Doctrine, Use of Nuclear Arms

*LD1705211393 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1800 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Today, Pavel Grachev, head of the Russian military department, held a briefing where he outlined Russia's military doctrine.

[Begin Grachev recording] The essence of the military doctrine lies in the fact that the doctrine has a purely defensive nature. Russia does not see any state as its enemy. Russia is ready to cooperate with any state which pursues a peaceful policy, both in the world and, above all, toward the Russian Federation. Russia will never be the first to start or declare war, if it does not come under attack.

The use of nuclear weapons is regarded as an extreme and forced measure. [end recording]

Pavel Grachev also confirmed that Azerbaijan is receiving arms via third countries.

### Zorkin Interviewed on Constitution Issues

*LD1705185093 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1520 GMT 17 May 93*

[Studio interview with Constitutional Court Chairman Valeriy Zorkin by unidentified correspondent; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Tell me, judge, do you, in your heart of hearts, agree with the principle of the division of powers into the legislative, executive, and judiciary?

[Zorkin] Not just in my heart of hearts, but externally, too. I think that if the principle of the division of powers were to disappear, it would mean that the division of powers would be replaced by a dictatorship. We have all been through that. Our whole history is one of striving to establish dictatorships. Ivan the Terrible, Lenin, Stalin are all symptoms of this striving. If we fail to distance ourselves from this, things will go bad for Russia. That is why the principle of the division of powers must be established as a stable factor.

[Correspondent] What, in your view, is at the roots of the crisis of power, the constitutional crisis we have recently been experiencing over the past few months?

[Zorkin] I think there have been many causes. The in-depth cause is to be found in the economy. To begin with, there was a clash between two major options: for and against reforms. This probably took place some two to three years ago. Subsequently, even those who originally were against reforms, as it were, became convinced that there was no other way. Incidentally, the referendum confirms this; namely, that the main—that is to say, the centrist bulk of the Russian population has unequivocally come out in favor of transformations. Now, I think, the point at issue surely concerns the methods of implementing them. When all is said and done, they do differ, but these differences are hardly a matter of indifference, because either we will take a great, big leap into the real future as a matter of inevitability, or else, taking account of the distinguishing features of Russia, its population and, as it were, its mind-set, we will adapt this whole undertaking accordingly and make it follow an irreversible and calm route in such a way as to avoid a revolution and, what follows, a counter-revolution. Well, this pendulum ought to enter the centrist mainstream, thus eliminating radical ways and methods.

There is yet another, obvious cause. It is to be found in all those carriers, so to speak, of all these trends both in the economy and in politics, above all. People's personal qualities cannot be ignored, that is natural—because one person is able to rally the bulk of the population around himself, while another incites people toward the most virulent forms of radicalism—there are various personalities and various natures and one cannot just ignore this.

[Correspondent] You mentioned a pendulum which is swinging ever more wildly, keeping everyone within, how shall we put it, within certain defined political areas. There exist extreme left-wing points of view, there also exist extreme right-wing points of view. This pendulum now reminds one of the training given, you know, to airborne assault troops who have to be put through their paces on various swings and roundabouts and on various levels, into the bargain.

However, let us recall the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies; its very beginning, when the chairman of the Supreme Soviet uttered the following sentence in what is his typical delivery—a ponderous, yet mouth-shooting type of delivery—that at long last the Supreme Soviet has concentrated in its hands the entire legislative, executive, and judiciary power.

[Zorkin] Well, I do not know, I do not recall such a sentence.

[Correspondent] But have a look at the transcript, after all it will be given to you, although it is now rather difficult to find this transcript in the Supreme Soviet, but I think you can do it.

[Zorkin] Well, when we say that someone has concentrated the legislative, executive, and judiciary power in his hands, it is tantamount to this person having accomplished a coup d'etat. No one has a right to do this in Russia as it is now, unless the constitution is, as it were, overthrown by this person. But, no matter what is said at congresses, other establishments, executive structures, elsewhere, public movements, what is at present necessary, you know, is that everyone should now work together on something you have mentioned—to avoid extreme left-wing and extreme right-wing attitudes. What is necessary is that the swings you have mentioned ought to be underpinned by civilized principles—a bit to the right, a bit to the left. This presupposes the existence of two large, centrist blocs. It may be that at the present stage they will unite as far as certain things are concerned and that they will create one movement. In such an eventuality, radicalism will have its head severed. By radicalism I understand statements of the kind you have mentioned. I have said, however, that I do not agree with your quote word for word, because, frankly, I recall no such phrase, and none such have been uttered either by the president, or by the parliament.

Both the parliament and the president have agreed to function on the basis of separation of power. After all, this is stipulated by the constitution [words indistinct]

[Correspondent] Valeriy Dmitriyevich, let's take the new constitution. In your opinion, is there a need for it?

[Zorkin] In this instance we are not talking about just an ordinary law submitted to the Constitutional Court and which then cannot be discussed, because the law forbids discussions about unadopted laws. Here we are talking about a special case, about a new constitution. Thus, if it is adopted, the court will probably act in the same way as now, it has no choice. We have sworn allegiance to defend the constitution. If there is a new constitution, we will act in the same way. However, if we are talking about the expediency, then you must ask me as a citizen...

[Correspondent, interrupting] The court does not assess the expediency...

[Zorkin, interrupting] No, we look at it from the judicial point of view. However, if you ask me this question, I can answer you as a citizen, as an expert, etc. One thing worries me here. When people talk about the new constitution, one gets the impression that we are acting in a void or a desert, but this is really not the case. We have a constitution which stipulates some of the most important principles of constitutionality. We must not forget about that when we strive for a new constitution. If we try to achieve a new constitution at all costs, we will be ignoring reality. At the same time, if there is already a constitutional movement—all right, it might have been forced upon us, maybe not, but now everyone is talking about it—it would have been another extreme to simply ignore it. Therefore, this movement for a new constitution must first of all prevent the adoption of a new

constitution from becoming a purely politicized process with political goals. We must avoid this.

[Correspondent] Because the court cannot study an unadopted law, especially an unadopted basic law, it seems to me that the task of the Constitutional Court in the process of designing and adopting a new constitution is probably to influence the legality of this process, to sieve it through a fine mesh, to look through it, to study it through a magnifying glass, through a microscope in order to determine the legality of the processes involved in designing and adopting this constitution, and probably to monitor how this constitution is designed, on which legal system this constitution is based, on which republic, or what type of legal system we will adopt. Are these questions within the jurisdiction of the court?

[Zorkin] Yes, you touched on a very important topic related to the procedure for the adoption of the constitution. Let us use this term, despite all its ambiguity. Since we live with a constitution, since we have a valid constitution, which practically all powers swore allegiance to, I think that in order to prevent a new constitution from being thrown at us from behind, so to speak, by force or some other methods, the Constitutional Court must fulfill its duty to protect and defend the current constitution. It seems to me that if we take into consideration the results of the referendum, there is an opportunity to implement this process calmly, in a civilized manner, on the basis of some sort of roundtable for the adoption of a new constitution. In order to achieve this, the legal powers which are to adopt the constitution must not be discredited. But at the same time, I think that they must take into consideration the present situation, and if the process is moving toward adopting a new constitution, they must not artificially torpedo it. This is the main point. The amalgamation of these two points will form the actual process of the adoption of the constitution.

It seems to me that because the constitution gives both the congress and the Supreme Soviet very important plenipotentiary powers in designing and adopting a constitution, they cannot be ignored. At the same time, it is necessary to involve the regions and republics. The situation is such that disregarding the republics would currently mean to impose a constitution from above. No constitution could exist that way.

In the same way, no constitution can be imposed by one side on the other. After all, a constitution means a compromise. What does a compromise usually consist of? It takes into account the interests of the regions, republics, other subjects of the Russian Federation, parties, political movements, economic interests and trends and finally central powers, including parliament, congress, president and so on. If all this is merged together, thanks to common sense and good will, I think a constitution, just like the American constitution, could live for some considerable time, not just 10, 15, or five years. If on the other hand, we try to adapt the constitution to make sure that someone's immediate interests are satisfied, such as, for instance, somebody's desire to avoid the congress or to scrap the post of vice president, then I think that would be a one day-constitution. In that case, what is the point of it? For the sake of what should one launch such a complex period? That is why the main thing is that compromise is necessary to douse the conflict and to set in motion the interests of all sectors and all the sides in that constitutional process. Then the congress, [changes thought], they are now saying the congress will not adopt the constitution. Of course it will adopt and ratify a constitution like this.

[Correspondent] You are saying that the constitution should be based on a compromise. But when the main law is based on compromise, that would be a politicized constitution, in favor of one or another public and political force. I think the main law, a constitution, must be completely uncompromising.

[Zorkin] You mean uncompromising with regard to constitutional principles? In that case I agree with you. Principles must not be distorted for the sake of a compromise in one particular situation.

That would not make any constitution solid. I spoke of compromise in relation to a pluralistic society. I think the referendum has confirmed this. Just think, the "yes" answers to the first and second questions on confidence in the president and his social policy, that is, the reform policy, and the "no" answers to the questions on the elections of the president and the legislative bodies show that the people want compromise.

The referendum pointed to a centrist trend among the politically active part of the Russian population. That is a sign for politicians: If they refuse to reckon with this and try to rock the boat with a view to pushing it toward one-sided radicalism, then I think there will be trouble. It is impossible, I think, to ignore that. That is the sense in which I am using the word "compromise." At all times, if constitutions were solid, this solidity was based on the interests of all the sides involved in the constitutional, political, and economic processes in society. They meant that people could live in a pluralistic society. When can right and left-wing people live in peace? When they move toward the center. If they take care of their one-sided interests, then the interests of other participants in the process will be ignored. Such a constitution would not be stable. It is not a matter of text but it is a matter of actual facts—that very pendulum, those very swings of which you spoke right at the start.

[Correspondent] You were the one who spoke about them.

[Zorkin] Certainly, I spoke about them too.

[Correspondent] Valeriy Dmitriyevich, suppose a new constitution, the main law, is adopted. Then the remaining laws will have to be brought into line with the main law. I have no certainty that the existing endless batch of laws, decisions, and legislative acts which have

been slapped together and adopted by the Supreme Soviet will correspond to a new constitution which might be adopted.

[Zorkin] You see, it is a problem of the whole legal system, not of its formal and legal aspect but of its essence, so to speak. For instance, do we have an integral strategic economic policy? No, we do not, I believe. Do we have a strategically thought-out nationalities policy? No, we do not. A legal policy, including combating crime, a strategic program? No, there is none. So the absence of a clear concept, which, as it were, could become the main line of development of the state and society, brings about, it seems, certain contradictions in legislation to which you alluded.

At the same time, I think that one should not overdramatize the situation either, because the existing bulk of legislation contains the main frame which makes it possible to carry out reforms. I would not agree with a claim that reforms are impossible because legislation is against them. Have a look at Poland. Reforms are being implemented in Poland, and quite successfully at that. But I will draw your attention to the fact that the 1952 Constitution adopted, it is said, by the then Polish leadership with Stalin's amendments, is still in effect in Poland. I do not want to say that we have to bring back our constitution of that time. I would simply like to emphasize to our listeners that one should not become obsessed with texts as such. The important thing is the way we interpret them, you see. If we agree that it is primarily the principles that are important in this text, the principles laid down in the existing constitution, I think that everything else will recede into the background, as it were. But if we disagree with the principles, then we are going to fish out details which will turn into quasi-principles, and the whole legal system will be destroyed.

[Correspondent] Well, today we may agree that certain principles are important and tomorrow there will be different principles. Perhaps, something that is called a documentary basis in a court trial should be solid and stable.

[Zorkin] Absolutely. Of course, for this purpose legislation—and not only the laws that you have mentioned but, I believe, the decrees and the whole normative basis—should be systematized.

But, as you say, today's principles are different from tomorrow's, but it seems to me that principles as a basis of human life come from various sources. They are as follows: All of this is done for the reform, for the economy based on market forces, but which also provides social security for the population, and therefore must be rectified under this angle, that is, it must not be the Wild West, which it has been for a rather long period, but a solid state system coupled with patriotism and a sense of fatherland, because people who lose their sense of motherland and fatherland—a word which becomes, how should I say, controversial, when spoken—but then this will be it, this space will then be dead [sentence as heard]. Do you remember with what pomp Clinton was celebrated? We had a program about it on our television. There, overjoyed youths with American flags were glorifying their American motherland, their fatherland.

[Correspondent] Maybe it was a certain part of the population.

[Zorkin] Yes, a part, but an active part of the population, the one that makes politics, participates in them. On top of that, you must not forget that Russia consists not only of Moscow city center, where confrontations between powers take place, and where, I hope, cooperation between them will grow. Russia is an enormous place, but this place is not empty. It consists of regions, republics, and krays. I think that the politician who will understand that at this moment one must put the interests of the regions very much to the fore, having united them from the perspective of the values that we have talked about—obviously first of all from the perspective of the rule of law, legality, constitutionality—I think that such a politician will have a great chance and will become a politician for the whole of Russia, rather than for one party or movement.

It seems to me that it is high time for consolidation of peace and national accord. Without such a policy the goals simply cannot be achieved, I think. The constitution must provide a legal basis for the implementation of this entire process, which would integrate the citizens of Russia into a single entity.

[Correspondent] I would still like to go back to the previous question. What will happen when a new constitution is adopted, what will happen to laws adopted now by the Supreme Soviet?

[Zorkin] Well, if the new constitution is adopted, then whatever happens will happen in accordance with it. If a law is contrary to the constitution it must obviously be tailored to this constitution. But I would like to point out to you once again that probably not as much will have to be rewritten as it seems now. Of course, it will be an enormous task, but it will not have to be done in a void because the current legislature, be it on privatization, on property, etc, etc, already has the basis on which to build a new system, a system, which, having abandoned totalitarianism, is evolving toward a socially orientated market economy, toward a solid state system on a legal basis, on the basis of separation of powers, and on the principle of market forces.

Does this not exist in current laws? Of course it does! They are geared toward this. Let us take the law on state of emergency. Although it is designed for a unique situation, it already includes the principle of separation of powers. It does not allow the president to declare a state of emergency on his own. It stipulates cooperation and adjustments by the parliament. The new constitution must also correspond to these principles, otherwise

we may find ourselves in a situation when the constitution will help to eliminate some basic principles of democracy, law-based state, and civilized economy.

[Correspondent] Judging by what you just said, one can assume that once again you are in favor of a constitutional assembly, which is so widely discussed at present.

[Zorkin] If one means by the constitutional assembly a body which does not usurp the rights of the legislative power to adopt a constitution, but rather helps to unite all the interests of Russia that we have mentioned and to prepare an approved text, then I think that it would be very difficult to be against such an assembly. It seems to me that in such a case the opponents would simply be taking an extreme stance. If the assembly becomes a round table for the adoption of the constitution, then the earlier it finalizes and polishes the text, the better it is for Russia.

[Correspondent] Who must approve the text of the constitution?

[Zorkin] The current constitution stipulates who must do it. There are two constitutional options. One is to pass it through the Supreme Soviet and to have it approved by the congress, and the other is to hold a referendum. Until a new constitution is adopted any other option would mean an anti-constitutional method of adopting a constitution. But believe me that a constitution created through unconstitutional means can never bring any good and can never be solid.

The Americans seemed to have created their constitution in blank space, they did not have a constitution before, but they created it on the basis of concord while relying on preliminary, preceding legal texts which proclaimed the beginning of legal statehood in the United States. If there is no constitutional concord, then strife and disagreement are bound to follow and the constitution will be thrown out, thus bringing about the next political crisis. Incidentally, this is what happened in France, which gradually arrived at a more or less civilized and stable constitutional system after 150 years.

[Correspondent] Valeriy Dmitriyevich, this is, perhaps, the last question. We started our conversation by stating that in this situation the Constitutional Court should sooner be a watchdog observing the procedure of adopting the new constitution. So the last question is this: In your view, as chairman of the court, which way should the new constitution be adopted?

[Zorkin] Well, I think that as both chairman, citizen, and lawyer, I have the same view, that the constitution should be adopted by a constitutional way. Any other way is that of confrontation, but we now have to avoid that and to attain national concord. The results of the referendum call for this.

[Correspondent] The two constitutional ways that you have mentioned are via the Supreme Soviet or at a referendum.

[Zorkin] The Supreme Soviet and the congress.

[Correspondent] The Supreme Soviet and the congress or a referendum.

[Zorkin] I think this will depend on the will of those taking part in the political constitutional process. I think that if they understand well Russia's interests, which should be integrated, there will bo no difficulties. But if each of them should seek unilateral advantages, then of course confrontation will start and the consequences are hard to predict.

[Correspondent] But what would the Constitutional Court prefer: the congress of people's deputies or the referendum?

[Zorkin] The Constitutional Court would prefer—and this is its only preference—that peace and national concord should reign in Russia. The constitution must be a constitution of peace, national concord, civil society, and law-based statehood. For this purpose, I believe, it should be adopted by the civilized way we have mentioned, and not bypassing the constitution, and elections should be set.

I would say that it is likely that Russia will not be able to avoid the elections of the branches of power—I mean the elections of the president and the legislative body. In that case nobody will refer to where he came from.

[Correspondent] Thank you.

[Zorkin] Thank you.

## Yeltsin Draft Seen as Threat to Democracy

*PM1805091593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 May 93 First Edition p 3*

["Expert Analysis" by O. Rumyantsev, senior secretary of the Constitutional Commission, and V. Lafitskiy, Constitutional Commission "expert": "Two Drafts — Two Views of the Separation of Powers"]

[Text] Before us are two draft Russian Constitutions. One has been prepared by the Constitutional Commission in the light of amendments submitted by the president, the Congress, the Supreme Soviet, the components of the Federation, and social organizations. The other draft was hastily put together by S. Shakhray, S. Alekseyev, and A. Sobchak.

Let us try to analyze calmly what Russia can expect if either version is adopted.

The draft presented by the Russian president prescribes a variation of the presidential form of rule which upsets the balance of powers and could serve, in our view, as a threat to the democratic foundations of the Russian state system.

It outlines the president's constitutional status quite forthrightly and leaves no doubt about the true intentions. According to Article 70 of the document, the

president is the head of state and guarantor of the Constitution and citizens' rights and freedoms. He "adopts measures to protect the sovereignty of the Russian Federation and its independence and state integrity and ensures the coordinated functioning and interaction of all state organs." Thus the president is not only placed outside the framework of the system of the three powers—the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary—but is also placed above them, in a situation typical mainly of authoritarian forms of rule that are a very long way from democracy.

This conclusion is confirmed by a whole series of norms in the draft which ascribe extraordinary powers to the president. For example, Article 74 envisages the early dissolution of the Federal parliament when it is impossible to form a government and in those instances when a crisis of state power cannot be resolved on the basis of the procedures laid down by the Constitution.

Under this draft the government is formed not by one party or a coalition of parties holding the majority of seats in parliament but by the president himself, who presents to the Federation Council (the upper chamber of parliament) only a candidacy for chairman of the government. A refusal to confirm any personnel appointment can lead to the dissolution of parliament—which essentially and unambiguously dictates parliament's approval of the candidate submitted by the president.

There is extreme ambiguity in the draft's provisions on the dissolution of parliament in other instances of a crisis of state power. It is noticeable that a president free of all control determines the existence of grounds for the dissolution of parliament. Thus the parliament is transformed into an organ without will and effectively without power because the threat of early dissolution is constantly hanging over it like the sword of Damocles.

The supreme legislative organ looks weak in other respects, too. Overturning the president's veto on draft laws that have been adopted becomes highly problematical. And the possibility of removing the president from office becomes completely unrealistic.

A lack of control over the president's actions permeates the entire draft. The president is not called the chief executive, but the range of his powers demonstrates his effective supremacy in this sphere. He approves the structure of the federal executive organs and the composition of the government (Article 107), he personally appoints ministers and other officials on the submission of the chairman of the government (Article 107), he dismisses the government (Article 111), he issues edicts and directives which are binding on the government (Articles 81 and 110), he submits draft laws to parliament (Article 74), he imposes a state of emergency in the country (Article 77), and he calls a nationwide referendum (Article 74). The full range of power is concentrated in the president's hands, but the draft envisages no mechanisms of accountability for the government's course.

Parallel structures—presidential and governmental—are effectively laid down within the framework of the executive. The former are assigned the role of a shadow but nonetheless real center of power along the lines of the Politburo and Central Committee of the CPSU. The latter are assigned the role of an impotent mechanism for transmitting policy formed deep within the presidential power system.

In addition to the right to reject draft laws and issue edicts equal in force to federal laws the president is also vested with the exceptional power of suspending laws if they contravene the Constitution or violate citizens' rights and freedoms (Article 80). Let us note that this is simply unparalleled in the constitutions of democratic countries.

By the artificial separation of the powers of the two chambers parliament forfeits the integrity of a single—albeit bicameral—organ of representative power. It is noticeable that State Duma's role in this is reduced even though it is the more representative chamber of the parliament. However, despite this, the extent of its powers is considerably inferior to that of the Federation Council, in other words the upper chamber. In particular, it approves changes to the borders between the components of the Federation, changes their constitutional-legal status, appoints the chairman of the government on the president's submission, resolves the question of confidence in the government or its dismissal, appoints judges on the president's submission, ratifies and denounces international treaties, resolves questions of war and peace, imposes a state of emergency, dismisses the president from office, and examines federal laws adopted by the State Duma (Articles 93, 94, 95, 96, and 97).

And all these most important questions are resolved by a small chamber in which half of the deputies' seats are assigned to the republics and other national formations. All these things are in breach of the fundamentals of the parliamentary system and nullify representative democracy.

Parliament is effectively deprived of any role in the solution of questions relating to the budget and finances, which are traditionally within the competence of the representative organs of power.

It should be stressed that the guarantees and main condition of the preservation of democracy and the rights and freedoms of the individual are a reciprocal limitation of the branches of power in which none is paramount. This was the predominant idea when the Constitutional Commission elaborated the mechanism of state power. According to the official draft Constitution, the Supreme Soviet, consisting of two chambers with equal rights, possesses the exceptional right of adopting and amending laws, approving the budget, and monitoring its execution. The procedure for forming the government that is envisaged enables the president, as head of state, to form the government without the petty

tutelage of the legislators. With the Supreme Soviet's consent the president appoints the chairman, deputy chairman, and members of the government who have responsibility for the general leadership of the economy, finances, internal affairs, foreign affairs, defense, security, that is, the "inner cabinet." The remaining members of the government are appointed by the president personally.

One of the distinguishing features of the Constitutional Commission's draft is that it ensures a balance between the legislature and the executive: The president cannot dissolve parliament and the parliament cannot dismiss the government. On the whole, the system of the separation of powers under the official draft may be defined by the following formula: a strong head of state (president), a strong parliament, an independent judiciary.

## Presidental Staffer on Constitution Drafts

*PM1805082193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 14 May 93 p 2*

[Interview with Anatoliy Sliva, deputy chief of the Russian Federation president's State Law Administration, by Petr Akopov: "You Cannot Make a Foundation out of a Screen, and You Cannot Create Parliamentarianism out of the Soviets"]

[Text] [Akopov] What is the fundamental difference between the president's draft Constitution and the other drafts, above all the Constitutional Commission's draft?

[Sliva] As Oleg Rumyantsev, executive secretary of the Constitutional Commission, said, the president's draft is 60 percent the same as the commission draft. But when we are talking about a historic document like the Constitution, it seems to me that percentage comparisons are inappropriate. There are correspondences, then? Thank goodness. So the ideas of different schools of constitutionalists are on the same track. But the drafts must be compared according to different criteria.

If we are talking about what a Constitutuiion is in general terms, mankind, academics, and the state evolution of other countries provided the answer a long time ago. We have been familiar for a long time with world democratic standards for constitutional provisions. If we take a major constitutional problem such as the enshrinement of human and civil rights and freedoms, then there is no scope for any monkey business, because there is an entire system of international law agreements on this score. This is the standard mankind has created. All right, particular countries have their peculiarities and their own particular features. But whom is the argument with here—one draft with another? I do not believe so. I believe the argument here is with mankind's achievements.

Then we have another problem. Russia is intent on becoming a genuinely federal state. It is the essence of the new Russia's statehood—getting away from the unitarianism that paralyzed the Soviet Union and continues to paralyze the Russian Federation.

Federalism is a very complex thing, with its own specific qualities in different countries. You would not find two identical federations. But if we are talking about Russia, about how it is to become a real federation, then that is extremely difficult. But that is what the president's draft Constitution attempts to do. It is not just that this draft is the most solicitous, nay tender in its treatment of the Federal Treaty, incorporating it in its entirety in the text of the Constitution. Of course, one can and must argue about how the treaty fits in with the rest of the text of the Constitution. But it was the president who took this step first, thus demonstrating that he cannot conceive of the building of a new federation and creation of a new Constitution for democratic Russia without the most active involvement of the subjects of the Russian Federation.

The president's draft gives a major role to local self-management. Real local self-government, in terms of the right of citizens to handle their own affairs in the provincial areas where they live: in cities, villages, and settlements. Local self-government functions independently of state power, is remote from it, and does not simply carry out the will of the state apparatus that stands above local self-government (no matter at what level—capital of a subject of the federation or federal authority). On this matter there are some well-known standards: There is the all-European charter of local self-government, signed back in 1985. Let us argue, but let us nonetheless aim for that standard, and not try to replace it with a system of representative organs of authority locally.

Parliamentarianism, as one of the basic building blocks of democratic countries' constitutions, is also present in the president's draft. Parliamentarianism, as a system that is not only topped off with a parliament, a legislative body, but one that incorporates an electorate, a multiparty system, and a democratic electoral law system. For better or for worse, this is stated in the draft. The draft talks about an actual two-chamber parliament. One can argue about how the powers are distributed between the chambers of parliament, about whether they are undermined by presidential authority. But the draft does pave the way for the building of a democratic two-chamber parliament in conditions of a real federation.

A massive, multifaceted, complex state like Russia needs a strong, powerful government at the head of the executive authority. And this is what the president's draft offers.

The judicial system in any state has a hierarchical structure and it must not be dispersed, split in half or split into three. Naturally, each level of the judicial system is guided only by the Constitution and the laws, which are protected by the courts. But, in my view, it is inadvisable to make the judicial system a many-headed

beast at the federal level. Indeed, judicial bodies must operate in a coordinated manner, and to that end the president's draft provides for the establishment of a Supreme Judicial Office.

We have equivocated so much over who is our head of state. We have a collective head of state—Central Executive Committee and Supreme Soviet Presidium. After the switch from the USSR, we in Russia somehow lost the head of state altogether. Juridically we are without one at the moment: According to the Constitution, the president is the top official, the head of the executive authority. The international community recognizes our president simply as the de facto head of state. The president's draft Constitution tries to resolve this question by actually naming the president as head of state and investing him with the relevant powers. Powers great and small. But does this undermine the government? It is distancing itself from the president and is operating pretty much autonomously. Is the president undermining parliament's rights? I do not believe the Federation Council and State Duma will be unable to defend their own interests. They are separate chambers, operating autonomously. The president has the right to sign laws adopted by parliament. But this is not a formal procedure. It is a means whereby the head of state controls the legislators. The legislators have their own means of controlling the head of state, even to the point of dismissing him. This is normal; it is the separation of powers. Indeed, the president now has the right to send a law back to parliament. What of it? The president has already sent back 50 or so laws and the Supreme Soviet has calmly defeated the presidential veto by a one-half vote. The draft envisages a two-thirds vote to defeat a presidential veto. This is accepted international practice. But this does not suit the Congress, because it is very high. That is, the debate is based on the premise that the president will oppose parliament. But won't the voters and the subjects of the Federation stand up for parliament? Will there not be an opportunity to influence the president legally as well as morally? There will at least be fewer half-baked, contradictory laws.

Time does not stand still. It is a time of tumult at the moment. It is a major switch from one formation, from one system of economic relations to another. Public and social processes are developing so swiftly that areas of incompatibility between the state of society and its elected parliament are the norm, which need not be feared. In Britain, a successful country, since 1945 the House of Commons, which is elected for a term of five years, has never seen out its term. It has been dissolved by the king or the queen on the advice of the prime minister, new elections have been set for a particular date, and the voters have injected new blood into the legislative body. And what do our opponents want? They do not want the institution of the early dissolution of the supreme representative body to exist at all. This means that another impasse will be created, that turbulence will spill over from parliament into the streets and squares and lead to clashes...

If we were to attempt to encapsulate the essence of the Constitutional Commission's draft and the president's draft, we would be faced with a choice: preservation of the system of soviets, or the building of a state in which power is based on parliamentarianism and local self-government. We say that we had a totalitarian state, with the CPSU at its core. There is no CPSU now. But in the totalitarian state the CPSU hardly ever operated without a screen. The screen was the soviets, from Supreme Soviet to rural soviets. My question is: Can you make a foundation out of a screen? I believe not. We need to establish parliamentarianism and local self-government. That is what the argument is about at the moment. Everything is focused on these problems and on federalism.

Many people want to put some kind of label on the president's draft, to call it the draft Constitution of a "presidential republic." But it is in the process of development, proposals and amendments are being studied, interests are being taken into account, and changes will be made to the draft. So we should not pigeonhole the president's draft in advance.

[Akopov] Does the presidential draft contain the elements of a confederation?

[Slliva] No. On the contrary, neither draft pursues the federalism principle consistently enough. Real federalism is both a strong federation and a strong central authority. I think that the subjects of the Federation will find their rights infringed in both versions.

As for other difficult areas of the presidential draft, I am puzzled as to whether the draft paves the way for progress in the formation of a multiparty system. There are also doubts about whether the powers of the parliament's chambers are balanced. The most puzzling thing here is not what is contained in the actual draft, but something that lies outside it, something that will directly affect the shaping of the final text of the Constitution. It is the problem of the current legitimacy of the authorities within the actual Federation subjects. I believe this to be one of the most acute problems. Whereas the president had his legitimacy confirmed in the 25 April referendum, and the legitimacy of the actual subjects of the Federation as structures from which the state is formed is stated by the Federal Treaty, this is not the case in relation to the power structures within the subjects of the Federation. I cannot see that this legitimacy is safeguarded at the moment in the majority of Federation subjects. I will cite just one example. The law on the election of administration heads has been in existence for 18 months now. I am not saying that moratoriums on the election of administration heads have been declared and extended on the initiative of a particular branch of authority. But it is a very heavy brake on both political and economic reform. If only we had now administration heads elected by the people in at least half of the Federation subjects! In this period, by the new people. But this we do not have. Yet it is the driving force behind any reform in one direction or the

other. And the results of the referendum, broken down regionally, confirmed this. I would connect the two problems: the adoption of a new Constitution and the election of administration heads. We are not going to arrive swiftly at a constitution with the soviets or representative bodies that replace them in the provinces. So we must have elections of administration heads in krays, oblasts, cities, and rayons. Some 28,000 administration heads are operating at the moment, and barely more than a dozen of them are elected.

But the new authorities replacing the soviets in the provinces must be their successors. I do not like it when people say: "Down with the system of soviets!" It would be better to do away with the system of soviets and build a normal parliament and normal local self-government. But in abandoning the system of soviets we will not only be burying it; we will be its heirs as well. A bad legacy, a grim one? But it is our burden, so let us bear it.

[Akopov] In what way can the new Constitutiuon be adopted, in your view?

[Sliva] We have to find a way of ensuring the legitimate adoption of the Constitution. The subjects of the Federation must participate in the constitutional process. The president has already said that it is advisable to convene a constitutional conference. The constitutional process cannot be initiated artificially. And we must answer the most fundamental question: "Is the constitutional process under way and is the end of the three-year constitutional jamboree in sight?" If so, then life will reveal all. The process had been under way, albeit haltingly, since last December, culminating in the referendum in April, in which the word "constitution" was banned. This is very bad, because the people were not allowed near such an important question. Now we do not have even the basic provisions of a Constitution which weathered the referendum. So there are two ways of adopting a Constitution: a struggle either at the top and within the subjects of the Federation (a struggle over constituent Constitutional Assembly and Federation Council) or through a referendum. Don't go hollering about the people being incompetent, about constitutional questions being beyond them. The new Constitution is the people's future, and they can and are entitled to decide it for themselves.

## Security Bodies Slack on Constitutional Order

*LD1805102693 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0900 GMT 18 May 93*

[Text] In the opinion of the Procurator General's Office, Russia's security and Interior Ministry bodies are not giving enough attention to the issues of protecting constitutional order. According to ITAR-TASS, this conclusion was reached after a check conducted by the Procurator General's Office. A memo from Procurator General Valentin Stepankov to the Russian president and Supreme Soviet says that in response to many reports about threats to authority, security bodies have been forwarding documents for legal assessment instead of bringing to account those responsible. A similar approach is also characteristic of the Russian Ministry of the Interior. According to the Procurator General's Office, Interior Ministry bodies have repeatedly evaded registering and processing materials against organizers of unsanctioned rallies and other mass events, as well as against those who take part in them. They did not institute criminal proceedings in instances when this was called for by the law.

## Khasbulatov Views 'Crisis of State'

*PM1705123193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 May 93 pp 3-4*

[Article by Ruslan Khasbulatov: "Crisis of State and Ways Out of It"]

[Text] **Parable of the Locust**

All today's Russian economic activity was once described by Aleksandr Pushkin:

The locust flew and flew and settled, sat and ate everything. It sat and sat and then it flew away again.

Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy's report at the 16 April Russian Supreme Soviet session relieves me of the need to indicate who today can be regarded as the "locust." And only through an inability to think is it possible to continue to assess the government's economic activity in 1992 and early 1993, which has led to the rapid growth of parasitical forms of "economic management, that is to the flourishing of this "locust," as an economic reform.

The consequences of this "reforming" of the country's economy will take many years to overcome. But it is already clear today that in the economy it is quite complicated to implement positive changes without reforming the political system, in particular without overcoming the existing dualism of executive power, when the president's administration and the government are operating in accordance with the principle of haphazardness.

So far effective parliamentary mechanisms, with whose aid it would be possible to impede the destructive mechanisms and course pursued in the interests of a tiny minority of the population, have not been created in the country. And the reason for this is also that the very existence of Russian statehood has been threatened. If the state can convincingly be compared with an edifice in which hundreds of millions of people live, comprising with this edifice a single common home, then for the third time this century our common home has found itself in danger. There are numerous confirmations of this.

If the first referendum of 1991 led the Union to its death and laid the foundation to Russia's collapse, the 25 April referendum and the subsequent bloody May Day events in Moscow are landmarks in the offensive against

democracy in the country and against human rights and mark the degeneration of a political system aware of its inability not only to pursue reforms by peaceful means but also simply to manage the country.

**Threat to the Country's National Sovereignty**

The catastrophic position of the economy has placed the existence of Russia's state sovereignty under threat.

Essentially there is no effective mechanism of currency and customs control or control over exports and there is no border guard.

Russia's border is indeed "transparent," but its transparency is one-sided. Thus, a considerable mass of raw material is exported from Russia without any authorization from the relevant organs or with authorization from organs which do not have the right to give authorization of that kind. For instance, during the "Tral" operation last year alone, the internal affairs, customs control, and security organs prevented the export from Russia of 900,000 tonnes of petroleum products, 35,000 tonnes of nonferrous metals, 54,000 cubic meters of timber, and other output worth 20 billion rubles [R].

That alone shows that to export half the national product from the country there is absolutely no need to build new oil pipelines and sea ports, as Yegor Gaydar states.

In reality in 1992 according to many estimates Russia lost about $20 billion. Actually, the variation in these assessments is quite great—from $17 billion to $40 billion. If you change the dollars into rubles at the present exchange rate then the result is that capital worth approximately R15-18 trillion has "left" Russia. As we can see, this sum could even be in excess of the sum of the gross product produced in 1992 (R15 trillion).

This "openness" of our state, the "state's departure from the economy," which the pioneers of the reforms of early 1992 were seeking, are having a destructive effect on the prospects for stabilizing the financial and economic situation.

Above all there is a drastic change in the actual structure of industry. Enterprises connected with the extraction and processing of raw material, particularly oil, have found themselves in a privileged position. And the trends are such that if right now the profit from this situation has been received by the extracting and processing regions, in the future (especially if relations between the subjects of the Federation are broken) only the regions which extract raw material will be able to secure themselves an affluent future. That is why privatization is being carried out hastily in those regions, the single complex is being smashed, and those subdivisions of enterprises marked by their abundance of modern technology are really being gnawed out. That will undoubtedly facilitate the arrival here of mafioso and comprador and foreign capital, which in the future will determine the main avenue of Russian industry's development. And will indeed determine regional policy, linking it to the interests of international financial and industrial groups—interests that are alien to us.

Many enterprises, particularly those connected with science-intensive, high-precision production, have now been obliged to sell nondisposable stocks of raw material. These are mainly precious and rare-earth metals. The mass export of metals abroad is leading to a reduction in their price. The European community has already on several occasions applied antidumping sanctions against Russian producers of copper, aluminum, and other metals, although the greater part is exported via the Baltic countries and by those countries' firms. As a result, in the estimation of the government commission led by S. Aksenov, strategic raw material is being sold "most of which was produced in the republics of the former USSR and is lacking in Russia." Later we will nonetheless have to buy this raw material, but this time at world prices.

The domestic market is being stripped bare. Thus, the lack of fuel and lubricants is restricting primarily the production and processing of agriculture. The misfortunes of the countryside have already been mentioned repeatedly, but the situation is not changing. The countryside is close to a state where all its output will go to meet the rural inhabitants' own needs. That is, there is a return to subsistence farming. And as a result Russia's dependence on grain imports will be intensified even more.

What an absurdity! At the Vancouver meeting a credit line was opened for the purchase of grain in the United States to the sum of $700 million. About half that sum will be spent to pay transport costs.

Yet it is clear to everyone that it is not only the Western producers and firms engaged in commercial shipments but also those Russian officials who make purchases and redistribute the acquired grain in Russia that are interested in continuing these grain purchases. And these officials have been doing this for three decades and on ever increasing scales.

And what do we have in exchange for the imported raw material? In 1992 the main mass of imports consisted of confectionery, foodstuffs, alcohol, and tobacco. For instance, the "American Poultry" firm planned to import chicken legs to our country in exchange for oil.

That is, our participation in international trade complies with the best traditions of many countries' colonial past. Evidently it is that option which accords with Russia's entry into the world community, about which Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev is so concerned.

Even the facts cited above are enough to conclude that Russia has either failed to acquire or is losing internal sovereignty. Essentially the declaration on Russia's sovereignty and independence has in reality turned out to be only a declaration.

The most unacceptable thing for Russia and its people is the increasingly evident subordination of the country's domestic and foreign policy to the interests of the world powers. Matters have gotten to the point where the U.S. President has demanded the resignation of Central Bank Chairman Viktor Gerashchenko and our president has hastened to execute his will—he has asked an experienced banker to go. Is that not humiliating to us?

Over the state's many centuries of history its people have undergone many ordeals. There have been periods of the rapid development of the economy and culture and the unusual surge of the people's spirit as a result of major military victories. There have also been periods of decline, of crises and defeats, when the confusion in people's souls paralyzed public will, instilled uncertainty, and fate was frightening. There have been all kinds of things. But a Russian man, a Russian, has never had the misfortune to see the unconditional subordination of domestic and foreign policy to the interests of other countries. Our economic, military-political, and cultural affairs have never been led by foreigners.

Today their "useful" advice often proves to be above the laws adopted by the Supreme Soviet and the decrees of the congresses of people's deputies.

Or take the following detail... In what state can it happen that the minister of finance at the same time holds the post of director of an international bank? But it turns out that in our country it is possible. And our minister is obviously more punctilious and detailed in reporting the state of the national economy to the international bank than to the Russian parliament. What times, what morals!

A lot is said about the confrontation between legislative and executive power. It does exist, but its direction is different from what it seems to some people. The legislators (except for the "latterday Jacobins"—the radical democrats) are opposed to the subordination of the Russian Federation's national-state interests to international financial and industrial groups. They are opposed to the destruction of the country's defense potential. Opposed to Russia's transformation into a colonial enclave region which performs the role of a mere source of strategic raw material for the world economy and of an "overflow" for obsolete technologies. Opposed to the weakening of our state's international positions. Opposed to anyone—whoever that "anyone" might be—lying to the world community about the true situation inside the country, slandering tens of millions of his dissatisfied fellow citizens, calling them reactionaries, "sovs," and revanchists in a manic desire to gain "external support." We are against "anyone" by his obsequiousness belittling the dignity of the state and the people. Is there not something disgusting about those TV meetings when one side arrogantly gives a pat on the shoulder and the other radiates devotion and the readiness to fulfill any edict? And you can also see intellectual inadequacy which goes beyond mere ignorance... Again and again you have a feeling of shame and humiliation.

**Crisis in System of Management**

In 1992 and early 1993 the system of state management was destroyed. And that happened by no means because of the "opposition of the soviets," so frequently mentioned by representatives of the "democratic" camp and the president himself.

The corruption at virtually all levels of the management system shows that the apparatus is unable to fulfill socially important functions and is engaged mainly in securing benefits and privileges for itself. And it is on this ground that the bulk of the conflicts are taking place which, in order to conceal the crux of the matter, blame the soviets, calling them "constitutional" conflicts. And the present campaign aimed at "forcing through" the president's constitution was largely mounted with a view to distracting people from the terrifying conditions in which they have found themselves.

They say a fish rots from the head down. Back in 1991 it was already clear how outside the framework of the Constitution, generating substantial contradictions in the system of management, in confrontation with each other, they began to create various structures of executive power: the Council of Ministers, the State Council, the president's administration, an enormous number of organizations and institutions "under the president," and numerous minir organizations. Naturally, contradictions began to arise between them. And when the contradictions within the executive power itself ceased to be resolved through the efforts of the president and, moreover, they were intensified by him, the parliament was drawn into the conflict, and eventually accused of every mortal sin.

But even today two powerful structures are operating in parallel: the government and the president's administration (office). One is constitutional, the other is nonconstitutional, conceived as a technically auxiliary structure under the president. But in fact, having "given birth to itself" like Osiris in ancient Egypt, the president's administration (office) has considerably more influence on decisionmaking than the government.

How powerful this structure is may be judged if only by the fact that more money is spent on its maintenance than is spent on the maintenance of parliament with all its congresses. A fact which for some reasons remains "in the shadows." Thus our super-radical press keeps quiet on the subject, yet it is so fond of calculating parliament's expenses!

Actually, there are plenty of political commissars engaged only in politics not only in the administration but also in the government and outside it—in the "shadow governments" maintained by the state and generously financed illegally, without the legislators' authorization.

The economy incurs enormous losses from the illegal actions of top officials. The country's economic security depends on this. Weapons, oil, nickel, titanium, and

other types of strategic raw material, especially nonferrous metals, are illegally exported to various parts of the planet. Embezzlements, bribery, and fraudulent operations acquire a multinational nature. They are covered by legal entrepreneurial activity and export and import operations. Here the profit sits in foreign banks.

The structures of executive power like the government and presidential structures seem not even to set themselves the task of halting this criminal activity.

And from the viewpoint of the organization of management they do not work either. Unwieldy structures do not help but hinder the management of the state. In his 16 April speech at the Supreme Soviet the vice president cited examples of the tribulations connected with the organization of control organs. We can see that the president's edict have been ignored by the top people in the government: Gaydar, Burbulis, Chubays, Poltoranin, Kozyrev, and others. The unwieldy nature and duplication of management structures merely help to create an atmosphere of uncontrollability in the activity of the management apparatus. And that is no accident: According to Gaydar, the government and officials are afraid of losing levers for managing the redistribution of property.

The state apparatus has always been Russia's Achilles' heel. Always "the dressing gown he wears at home has always hung down below the official's uniform," to use Konstantin Aksakov's expression. This is largely connected with the poor system for training state apparatus cadres.

But this situation is also explained largely by the fact that in Russia's history there have been few periods when the management apparatus has indeed been in the grips of an idea for organizing it: the idea of supporting an effective statehood. There is no understanding of that idea to this day. It has been replaced by a pathological desire for personal power—even at the cost of the collapse of the state itself. There have been feeble attempts by pseudodemocratic ideologists to elaborate a common idea aimed at the development of statehood. But they failed—if only because the ideologists' plans included only the weakening of the state. In response to the attempt to destroy the notorious "administrative edict system," the management apparatus did not simply borrow democratic phraseology and means of struggle but also became a parasitical social stratum under the cover of those same ideologists.

Yes, today we are in need of the restoration of the idea of statehood in which an important (but controlled) place would be assigned to the management apparatus. The management apparatus right now has virtually gotten out of subordination to the government, it identifies its interests as those of a specific "bureaucracy class." And, taking advantage of the weakening of state power bases, it is exercising its own "autonomy" as a source of the accumulation of capital.

Recently there has been a "tough purge" of the top executive apparatus and inconvenient people are being removed from the government even though their competence has never been in doubt. But they proved too honest for the regime—they are Skokov, Khizha, and others. They are being replaced by "devoted" (to whom?) ideologists ready to serve anyone in return for high office and privileges. That is a very dangerous tendency.

**Crisis of the System of Law and Federal Relations**

Modern management is deemed effective when the making an implementation of a decision depend not on the will of a particular official but on existing norms and rules, whatever they may be, good or bad. Hegel once wrote that "the collapse of the state is manifested primarily in the fact that everything proceeds differently from the way required by the laws." Meanwhile the word "legality" as applied to our present-day management apparatus seems like a kind of phantom from another world. Although why accuse officials of lawbreaking and corruption if the top state official himself, formerly in offices but now publicly too, is displaying his scorn for the Constitution?

Of course, the people's deputies themselves created favorable soil for these actions by the president and his "team." Many of our fellow citizens rightly point that out. Including in letters to the Supreme Soviet.

In the past, at the fifth Congress, the majority of people's deputies voted to grant additional powers to the president to implement a radical market reform. He was granted broad rights in creating management mechanisms and in adopting edicts of a normative nature on many issues. Throughout 1992 the president had no cause to complain of lack of powers. And no one hindered him, indeed there was simply no one capable of hindering him. Thus there began the "habituation" to boundless and uncontrolled power.

The term of the president's additional powers expired 1 December 1992. But even since then the president has continued to issue edicts in accordance with these powers (for instance the edits "on the federal treasury," "on the USSR's state treasure commitments"—there are dozens of them). That is, what I want, I do. What does this example say? It says that in Russia right now there is no single legal system. It has been split into two, as it were: One half is based on the constitution and the laws, the other on the president's "edict-based" law.

Specialists know that the president's so-called "edict-based law" is not a law in the full sense. Moreover, being in itself unstable—because of the constant repeal of edicts and their overtly politicized nature—the president "edict-based law" cannot have a stabilizing effect on the economy or on politics.

The laws, however, passing through all stages of legislative procedure, consider the interests of various strata of the groups of the population. And, most important, the

interests of the subjects of the Federation, on a systematic basis. It must be borne in mind that it is impossible in principle to replace laws with any edicts. Unfortunately, that fact remains incomprehensible to those who are "driving" edict-based law.

Of course, a situation in which the single law system has been as it were split in half has an adverse effect on the economic and social systems. But instead of executing the laws and acting strictly within the framework of the Constitution, as befits the state's top official, the president is seeking to free himself from the Constitution. That is an absurdity for any democratic state undeniably for a politician who supports democratic reforms.

Particularly indicative in this respect is the president's March address to the citizens of Russia. In fact the president did, after all, declare that he was creating his own Constitution—through his own edicts. And indeed, something of the kind was created. In particular there was the mechanism of the activity of supreme state power, in accordance with which, as initially planned, it was impossible to repeal the president's edicts and directives and the government's decrees. Here too he "regulated" federal relations: He removed two heads of administrations, established his own right to interfere in the internal structure of republics, oblasts, and krays, despite the fact that these actions contradicted the section of the Constitution on the Federation Treaty. Mordovia also experienced drastic measures: An edict of the Russian president determined that Guslyannikov would be president, in spite of any parliaments and republican sovereignties.

The president's "new new" draft constitution (a new version of the old version, the Sobchak, Alekseyev, and Shakhray version in an even worse form) confirmed the path which had been chosen, an openly fatal one for the country. "Apres moi le deluge," one French monarch said. The same cynical choice guided them in the days of the putsch in our country—incidentally, the French monarchy soon perished then.

But the question nonetheless arises: What kind of system do we have today—a republic, a monarchy, or a dictatorship? The president bestows the Constitution on the subjects, determines their personal rights, and is free to heed or disregard the law-drafting parliament (it is a law-drafting parliament that he would like to have).

Therefore it can also be said that in Russia today, despite the constitutionally democratic order, there is no longer clarity as to the form of rule—precisely by virtue of the unilateral violation of constitutional order and the distortions in the separation of powers perpetrated on the spur of the moment. The dualism of the legal system existing today also leads to this. The presence of the attributes of republicanism in the shape of the president, parliament and courts elected by all the people (they are all, incidentally, elected by the entire people and not only our president!) does not in itself say anything. All these institutions swiftly lose their seemingly democratic appearance if power begins to use illegal methods. It is that which explains why the state system is unstable and is not only failing to stabilize social processes but also contains destabilizing factors itself. And the main destabilizing factor of state power is the unconstitutional, illegal activity of the president himself.

The regions are feeling the entirely adverse effect of the struggle for power in the center. It should be noted that many regions are trying to take steps which would curb the adverse consequences of the political struggle in the center. I shall cite just one example.

In the Republic of Tuva for a long time the local leadership managed to restrain separatist manifestations on the part of various groups and organizations. Although relations between the indigenous population and Russian "newcomers" had been quite tense since 1989 because of the political interests of different groups of citizens. But immediately after the president's 20 March address to the citizens of Russia, the Republic of Tuva Supreme Soviet adopted an amendment to the Constitution according to which the republic acquired the right to leave the Russian Federation. This was said with bitterness by the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, pointing to the main source of the instability and separatist regionalistic tendencies as a whole in our country.

And what of the promises to support Dudayev's regime in Groznyy and Mordovia's thieving "president?" Does that not shame us all together?

In this connection it must be noted that some officials do not attach importance to political processes in the regions. I want to recall that is was this ideology which prevailed in 1991 on the eve of the Belovezhskaya Forest agreement. It was asserted: We are ready to begin radical market transformations but our neighbors—particularly the Central Asian republics—are holding us back. There was no understanding of their responsibility for the fate of the state and of millions of people. But now that the Union has been destroyed, has it become easier to implement reforms?

Speaking of the collapse of the Union, one cannot fail to see that Russia passed through the first stage of its collapse when the USSR collapsed. After all, the USSR was a complex state formation: At the same time it also acted as the Russian state.

Russia itself will have to experience something similar if federal ties are broken. And these ties are tense now. It may even be said that right now the functions of central power come down to confirming that the state is losing power.

Thus today the crisis encompasses all spheres, all forms and manifestations of statehood. If present trends persist it could be a case of Russia losing its statehood. All those who are involved in the fate of the country and its peoples, its historical memory, and the spirit of the great state must understand that.

**Ways To Escape From the Crisis of Statehood**

Of course, the idea that Russia might lose its statehood may seem a great exaggeration. But let us remember that few people believed, even in fall 1991, that the USSR could collapse. However, it only took a few abrupt political steps on the part of the republic's top officials for the USSR to disappear. And this was followed by civil war in Tajikistan, Georgia, and Moldova and economic collapse in Ukraine and Russia. Signs of disintegration are already appearing in outlying regions of Russia: Dudayev's extremist regime in Chechnya, the comprador regime in Kalmykia. Soviets are being dissolved everywhere as representative organs of power and authoritarian tendencies are everywhere.

Many people today realize that if something happens to Russia, the consequences may be even worse than when the Union broke up.

Regrettably, the range of means to preserve and revive Russian statehood is not that great. And it is diminishing with every day. We have ended up caught between a rock and a hard place: On the one hand there is the danger of Russia's disintegrating and on the other the danger of a reversion to "tough" methods of implementing state policy. This has been graphically demonstrated by the bloody events of May Day in Moscow and the regime's sliding into repressions. After all, as you know, extremes meet. It is quite possible that an attempt might by made by the authorities via mass repressions to halt the disintegration of Russia, a process provoked by the actions of those same authorities. Attempts to resolve the current state crisis by dictatorial, anticonstitutional means will inevitably bring about the breakup of Russia. Which is what influential international political and financial-industrial circles are seeking (and in the most blatant manner). They are after all providing powerful backing for the anticonstitutional actions taken by the incumbent regime, spurring on actions in this direction, and provoking conflicts with the legislature.

Are there opportunities for a constitutional resolution to the problem of state stabilization? Yes, there still are. Although often what is proposed only possesses a semblance of constitutionality. But any political means will prove ineffective as long as people fail to realize that the revival of the state is their common affair. By the strictest criteria it is participation in state building that makes a person a citizen and a patriot. The state itself is a legal organization of the Fatherland. And the state can only be revived if the legal nature of the transformations is preserved, that is primarily via existing constitutional mechanisms. Any departure from the laws, the constitution, and from constitutional procedures for adopting the Fundamental Law, whatever reasons are used to justify it, leads only to destruction.

In this connection the following question arises: Are those people who have embarked on anticonstitutional actions by proposing the draft of a "new new constitution" not trying specially to embroil the components of the Federation in the anticonstitutional process? In order to bind these components to themselves, making them accomplices in the anticonstitutional adoption of a new Constitution. These devices have been worked through. We have after all had Gorbachev's Novo-Ogarevo plan for the Union of Sovereign States and the Belovezhskaya agreements on the CIS.

I would like the leaders of republics, krays, oblasts, autonomous formations, and okrugs to know the kind of dangerous games in which they are being embroiled. The ultimate purpose of these games is to implement the second and final phase in the collapse of Russia. Is it really not clear that the Constitution should only be adopted by constitutional means—via the Constitutional Commission, the Supreme Soviet, and the Congress of People's Deputies?

Everyone—the government, the president, components of the Federation, public organizations, and associations of citizens—should of course work on and finalize the draft. To this end I think it necessary to make use of the mechanism that brought us success when the Federation Treaty was being drafted: It is a question of reviving the standing working groups of plenipotentiary specialists from the components of the Federation. In view of the fact that the Federation Treaty is to become an integral part of the new constitution, this group could carefully analyze other sections of the draft Constitution and coordinate the contradictory parts of which there are plenty in the draft published recently in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA.

That is the only way that the constitutional crisis can be resolved, a crisis which is not, incidentally, the objective result of the radical economic and political (democratic) transformations. This crisis is rather a deliberate result stemming from the specific actions of political forces and officials.

What actions? Let me cite some of them. First, the fact that the president has been given superpowers via amendments to the existing Constitution; second, not satisfied with that, the Congress agreed to the president unconstitutionally "usurping" the post of head of government; third, the same Congress gave him the right to issue edicts that go beyond the framework of the Law on the President and beyond legislation as a whole.

All this, along with the total lack of responsibility for adopted decisions, accustomed the president to feel that he was an absolute monarch. And that was how he began to act. These actions also brought about the crisis of power and statehood.

Now the parliament, seeing the fatal nature of political concessions, has firmly embarked on the path of following the principles of constitutional legality.

Herein lie the foundations of the constitutional crisis, rooted in the executive power's desire for self-absolutization and supraconstitutionality. All this has already featured in our country's history—when the

party elite held absolute power. Obviously, it is far more usual for the president to rule like that than to take part in the complex democratic system which presupposes the need to consult and agree with the parliament.

Let me emphasize once again that all other reasons for the constitutional crisis are groundless, farfetched, and represent an unnecessary complication. The existing constitution does not stand in the way of any reforms, and legislators are doing their job as they should.

The fact that the opponents of true democracy and parliamentarianism are seeking people to blame for their economic failures is another matter. And they are finding them—in the constitution, the parliament, the Congress, the regions, and fairly sober members of the government and the presidential apparatus. They constantly make a fuss... And direct their slander at all quarters—at their people, the parliament, the vice president, and the Constitutional Court...

Had they used that method alone, that would have been OK. But the pressure is coming in all directions. The general prosecutor's office is virtually afraid to investigate the cases that the vice president mentioned at the Supreme Soviet session. The vice president has been subjected to insults and ostracism by buffoons on television and from ministerial platforms. Other law-enforcement bodies (the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Security) come under the extremely rigid supervision of the president's men. Members of the Constitutional Court are being blackmailed: One person is "fixed up" [svodit] with a foreign intelligence agent in order to be subsequently discredited; another is promised the post of general prosecutor; another is threatened with "apartment revelations," while several others are simply being blatantly intimidated with physical violence, subjected to mental pressure, and summoned before the head of the president's administration "for instructions"...

Traditionally very strong pressure is put on deputies by various means. There is no aversion to outright bribery with money, apartments, posts, "minor" services, and priority consideration of deputies' requests from okrug voters. People are drawn in dubious operations and then it is simply a technical matter: blackmail, intimidation, use of the services to prepare a dossier of semifabricated, semitrue facts. All this is done to discredit undesirables.

The Federal Information Center and television, whose destructive power is clearly underestimated by society, are an exceptionally powerful instrument for slander and special propaganda.

Now, following the referendum when 70 million (out of 107 million) voters either failed to turn up at polling stations or voted against confidence in the president and his reform course (36 million voted "for"), this result has been presented as a victory But if that is a victory, it is a Pyrrhic one. There has been a further weakening of state power.

Fresh steps are being taken to discredit the Congress as the supreme power in the state. Many deputies are being promised "mountains of gold" if they give up their mandates. If it proves possible to implement the plan that I would call the Burbulis-Poltoranin and Co. plan, this will result in the paralysis of constitutional power and open up the way for a pseudoconstitution to be pushed in via a constituent or constitutional gathering, assembly, or Federation Council. It will lead to the dissolution of representative organs of power and ultimately cause the "Kalmykization" of Russia.

Some pseudoelections in the regions are already being prepared, while manic radicals, who for some reason call themselves democrats, are beating the victory drums and Western leaders are rushing to help suppress the shoots of freedom and democracy in exchange for guarantees of colonial status from Russia's "democratic leaders."

This will of course be followed by the immediate breakup of the Russian Federation with the inevitable emergence of fresh "hotspots" and the armed forces will disintegrate (as planned), as will organs of law and order and security.

This is a prospect that should be realized not only by people formulating the idea of destroying the Congress and the parliament, but also by those deputies who are inclined to sell the trust of their voters and the Russian state for "30 pieces of silver." Is it not better for those deputies in whose constituencies the constitutional majority of the voters advocated early elections to lay down their mandates? In that case the Supreme Soviet would immediately announce elections of new deputies to these districts.

**The Balkanization of Russia**

The idea of disbanding the Congress is of course nothing new. As Gennadiy Burbulis acknowledged after his withdrawal from state posts, straight after August 1991 there was a gamble on destroying the system of the Soviets and eliminating the Congress. But he said it proved impossible to "persuade" Khasbulatov to convene a Congress for this purpose. Although the conditions at the time were simply ideal The "enemy" was demoralized and the Congress would have adopted any decisions it was told to...

You must remember the result of the dissolution of the Union congress of deputies and the results of separate talks among the components of the Union (on the new Union Treaty) without the participation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. They ended in the breakup of the state. So when will we learn to take our own tragic mistakes into consideration?

It is time for not only deputies, ministers, and regional authorities, but for all citizens to realize the terrible danger looming over the country, threatening it with destruction, war, and a transfer to foreign powers' control.

Russia is threatened with "Balkanization"—this is a real threat in the near future.

Will the people really keep silent?

### More on Zorkin Speech to Regional Leaders

*PM1705155193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 May 93 First Edition p 3*

[Constitutional Court Press Service report: "Valeriy Zorkin: How To Safeguard Our State System Against Disintegration"]

[Text] On 12 May V.D. Zorkin, chairman of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court, addressed a conference of representatives of subjects of the Federation devoted to problems concerning the preparation of a new constitution. After noting the exceptional role of the regions, which have become involuntarily embroiled in the act of making a political choice between the two existing versions of the draft Basic Law and in preventing the disintegration of the Russian state itself, Valeriy Dmitriyevich spoke about the Constitutional Court's actions.

"The Basic Law of the state is the sole document which steers society toward the resolution of all conflicts by constitutional means. As people heading representative power at local level, you should be well aware that, if the Constitutional Court is empowered to rule on whether a particular situation complies with the Basic Law, which is our sworn duty, we will abide by the current Constitution, whatever it may be, until such a time as a new version is enacted."

As is well known, there have been differing interpretations in our society of the results of the recent referendum, and direct and indirect reproaches have been leveled at the Constitutional Court in this regard. It is claimed that if the threshold on Questions Two and Three had been lowered, a new general election would certainly have been held by now. Or, on the contrary, if the threshold on Questions One and Two had been raised, differences in interpretation of the referendum results such as we are now witnessing would have been precluded.

"We had no choice," Zorkin stressed, "because in our rulings we are guided not by emotion or political expediency, but by the Constitution alone, which at this period is represented by the Basic Law of the Russian state. Unfortunately the mass media, while 'publicizing' the dissenting opinion of certain judges in connection with our ruling, could not be bothered to 'decipher' the actual decree or its clear thrust. The first two questions on the referendum paper were not unambiguous, and as a consequence the answers received are ambiguous in nature."

"And what indeed does lie behind the wording 'trust in socioeconomic policy'? Of course, you may think that it means not just the main strategic thrust expressed in the reforms under way but also the methods of implementing them, the actual living standards enjoyed by people as a result of state policy. And consequently this wording alone contains at least three questions and answers. That is why the Constitutional Court decree records the fact that that the question itself, like the response, has more of a moral-political aspect, serving as a sign or signal to the authorities. You cannot therefore derive any one-sided advantages from this, let alone state that an affirmative answer to the question gives any kind of mandate for new constituent power. Just as it is invalid to draw from Questions Three and Four 'as a whole' the conclusion that this constituent power 'newly acquired' by someone has been 'lost' as a result of the referendum."

The chairman of the Constitutional Court described this ploy as a typical means of illegitimate exploitation of the results of the nationwide referendum. He stressed the danger in this context of exacerbating the conflict, which tends toward the destruction of constitutional legality and the growth of radicalism.

"Instead of living according to the law," Zorkin said, "an interpretation which is at odds with the most important principles of constitutional life is emerging. And peace and national accord are being destroyed as a result. What, after all, does the notion 'has obtained constituent power' mean? Does it mean that others have lost it, and that it is now possible to work toward the creation of a new Basic Law for the country by 'our own' unconstitutional route?

"Unfortunately these very conclusions are to be seen in one-sided interpretation of the referendum results, although the Constitutional Court decree on this question gives no grounds for this. Regardless of whether some people want to acknowledge this or not, all the branches of power have retained their 'constituent,' their primary powers. Moreover the people, who voted in the referendum against early new elections for people's deputies, confirmed the deputies' right to powers which, under the Constitution, belong to the legislative authority, with all the ensuing consequences."

"What is to be done is this situation?", the chairman of the Constitutional Court chairman asked himself (adding bitterly: "You get the feeling that you are seeing the nightmare enactment of the 20 March scenario..."). "In my opinion, you must bear in mind first and foremost what the Constitution is—a document which makes it possible for all branches of power and all parties to live in good accord. Incidentally, when you hear the claim that the referendum has opened up the way to overcoming the diarchy, this provokes, if not surprise, then natural questions. What is to be done, then, for example, about the constitutional norm of 'triarchy,' the need, far from fortuitously enshrined in the Basic Law, for coexistence among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of power? It is, after all, this very separation of power into autonomous branches which

serves as the best safeguard against tyranny and dictatorship. And even if you intend that government should operate as an autonomous, viable state system with all the variety of nuances envisaged in the Federation Treaty, could you really ensure this painlessly by unconstitutional means, by the exercise of unilateral will?

"But we should also consider what lurks behind the slogan 'overcoming dyarchy' en route to the 'ideal' system. Will we not again find ourselves as a result of all this 'contented' with the kind of future which already 'yawned' before us, which yawned before us at the end of the thirties?

"If the three branches of power have already been created and de facto exist, we must live according to the principle not just of separation but of accord among them. And that is only possible when there is respect for the Constitution.

"Radicalism is the main danger associated with illegitimate interpretation of the referendum results," Zorkin warned, "because this could have far-reaching consequences for the process of improving the existing Constitution—in which, incidentally, room has been found for the principle of the separation of powers, the Federation Treaty, and the Declaration of Human Rights."

The consquences of embroiling the country's regions in the conflict flaring up over the two different draft versions of the new constitution could be very dangerous. Even the documents in the Constitutional Court's possession on what is happening in, for example, Mordovia and Chelyabinsk cannot be seen as other than a general distress signal and as serious grounds for considering how to guard agaisnt the disintegration of Russian statehood. If we do not find a means together to bring to their senses those who wish to entice our unfortunate people with the latest illusions that we can step outside the Constitution, we will not see a rule-of-law state. As Zorkin said, winding up his speech at the meeting with representatives of the regions, the absurdity of what is now happening can be easily grasped by extrapolating it to a "foreign" example. Just try really to imagine a situation whereby, say, the American president states that he has resolved to "rejuvenate" the 200-year-old U.S. Constitution with his own version without "troubling" the Congress! There is no need to comment...

"This example," Zorkin said, "is not meant to offend either president but is merely chosen for its persuasive graphicness. A society which has even once tolerated unconstitutional action will take many years to attain constitutionalism or may never do so. Nor can you argue as the supporters of the presidential draft version of the Constitution have done recently: While acknowledging that it contains a manifest imbalance between presidential and parliamentary powers, they have gone so far as to say that this could be rectified within 15 years."

## More on Council of Ministers Presidium Session

*PM1805093193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 May 93 First Edition pp 1, 5*

[Report by Yekaterina Vasilchenko: "He Who Fails To Withstand Increase in Prices for Energy Carriers Will Go"]

[Text] At its 13 May session the Council of Ministers Presidium discussed the draft Federal program for the structural restructuring of the economy for the period through 1995 and the elaboration of targeted programs for the development of the Russian Federation.

In the interpretation of First Deputy Minister of the Economy Ivan Materov, the main problems of our economy today come down to the following. Production has declined 20 percent, while employment has declined only 2 percent. Consequently the remaining 18 percent has to be categorized as hidden unemployment, when people are registered in production work and receive a minimum wage but do virtually no work. If that continues, the deputy minister said, we will soon obtain the same picture in industry that we have in trade: Many small or simply weak enterprises which cannot resolve strategic tasks. To sum up: We must get the bankruptcy mechanism going at full speed as a form of economic natural selection.

But the second thesis of Materov's speech seems to contradict the first: The profitability of production, he said, is constantly falling because raw material and energy make up an enormous share of the price of a commodity. Because of this the producer cannot tangible lower the price even when there is no demand for the commodity and it cannot be sold. That is why it is necessary, as the West did during the energy crisis in 1973, to replace existing energy-intensive and materials-intensive technologies with new, economic ones and consequently we cannot manage without investments in production.

The state should concern itself with this in order to protect industry until a market is set up in the country and a demand appears for many goods. At the same time not a ruble above the budget has been earmarked for the implementation of the above-mentioned federal program and consequently all questions will be resolved through the redistribution of funds. On the basis of what principle? "We shall help the strong," Materov said. "The weak must perish."

The all-around development of the export of goods which cannot be sold in the country was cited as a third point.

How feasible is this problem, which includes so many "drastic" statements? In the opinion of the deputy minister, everything will be fulfilled exactly as written unless, of course, additional circumstances intervene. By circumstances we should obviously understand the possibility of mass demonstrations by the unemployed, who

will emerge in large numbers as a result of the program's implementation. Politics today, Materov said, can turn any economic program round 180 degrees.

Actually, even in the government itself there is no single opinion regarding this program, which gives the impression of a strictly theoretical work and to all appearances is the handiwork of minds accustomed to thinking only at the macroeconomic level. It is no accident that at the Council of Ministers Presidium a dispute flared up between the sectorial ministers and financial workers and representatives of the Ministry of the Economy.

According to the program in the immediate future the main avenues of government concern will be the fuel and energy complex, food, housing, transport, and conversion. Essentially there is nothing new here: These are the holy of holies for the governments of all developed countries. But whether all these directions will be successfully boosted by the above methods is a vexed question.

On the other hand behind the lines of the Federal Program one can clearly see another increase in prices for energy carriers. And this time, the deputy minister said, it will be not only a case of petroleum and petroleum products but also of coal.

### New Government Press Service Chief Appointed

*LD1805094993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0923 GMT 18 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow, 18 May—Valentin Sergeyev was appointed head of the Russian Government's press service today by Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin.

As a journalist, Sergeyev has worked at VODNYY TRANSPORT, STROITELNAYA GAZETA, and at PRAVDA. It was when working at PRAVDA that he was invited by the then prime minister, Ivan Silayev, to join the government staff and set up an information department. He was later involved in setting up a similar department for the president's staff.

Sergeyev subsequently became an advisor to Yuriy Petrov, chief of the presidential staff, who was dismissed, and more recently to the current holder of the post, Sergey Filatov. He has admitted that "it is not easy working with Sergey Filatov."

## Regional Affairs

### Caucasian 'Highlanders' May Act Against Russian Interests

*LD1405154393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1452 GMT 14 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—The next meeting of the Security Council will consider the situation in the Northern Caucasus, Russian Procurator General Valentin Stepankov told a news conference at the Russian House of Soviets here today. The news conference was also attended by head of the Russian Parliament's Council of Nationalities Ramazan Abdulatipov.

Correspondents were informed in detail on results of a North Caucasian trip of a Russian governmental delegation headed by Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin from May 10 through 11.

Estimating the role of the Highlanders' Confederation, the chairman of the Council of Nationalities said he is afraid of "this organization's possible plot against Russian interests". In his turn, Stepankov noted the Procurator's Office has prevented "confederation attempts to become a parallel state power" and expressed concern over the expansion of confederation armed units, who participate in combat operations in Abkhazia.

In accordance with the protocol of a meeting of the North Caucasian Coordination Council, it is planned to organize a meeting of North Caucasian elders in June, hold comprehensive hearings on settlement of the regional situation in the Russian Parliament's Council of Nationalities, prolong the state of emergency regime in Ingushetia and toughen responsibility for ethnic crimes, said Abdulatipov.

Speaking of measures adopted by Viktor Chernomyrdin to stabilize the North Caucasian situation, Abdulatipov mentioned the allocation of credits to the Ingush and North Ossetian republics, financing of the housing program, subsidies to restore an Ingush oil-processing plant, exemption of Ingushetia from some types of taxes, restoration of a Dagestan sea port, and continuation of the construction of power plant cascade in Dagestan highlands.

In the opinion of Abdulatipov, "federal bodies should be a mediator in easing tension in the Northern Caucasus, but abstain from gross interference in republican affairs." Noting the importance of this, Abdulatipov said North Ossetian representatives refused to sign the protocol of the North Caucasian Coordination Council meeting, as it contained an item on Russian departments' control over the safety of refugees on their return to places of permanent residence.

The procurator general actually voiced his inability to make answer culprits of grave crimes in the Ossetian-Ingush conflict zone. The Procurator's Office has revealed 1,729 persons to be brought to criminal responsibility, he said.

Still, in Stepankov's opinion, many of these persons are treated almost "as national heroes" and their arrest may result in a new coil of tension in the Northern Caucasus.

### Officials Assess Situation

*MK1505120093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 15 May 93 p 10*

[Andrey Smirnov report published in "Ramazan Abdulatipov News Conference" column: "Federal Authorities Attempt To Solve Problems of North Caucasus"]

[Text] At a news conference held yesterday in the Russian House of Soviets and devoted to the problems of the North Caucasus, Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities, spoke about some of the results of a visit to that area by a governmental delegation led by Council of Ministers Chairman Viktor Chernomyrdin.

Ramazan Abdulatipov gave special attention to a session of the North Caucasus Coordinating Council. The protocol signed at the session contains a number of proposals for the Russian Government designed to stabilize the situation in the region.

In particular it is proposed that the government extend the term of emergency rule primarily in order to safeguard the return of refugees to their homes. The protocol also envisions initiatives of an economic character, like, for example, the extension of soft credits to North Ossetia and Ingushetia, and also the reduction of contributions by these republics to the federal budget.

Abdulatipov expressed his regret over the fact that the protocol was not signed by the North Ossetian leaders who objected to the provision on the return of refugees. According to the chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, one of the upcoming sessions of this parliamentary chamber will be devoted to a detailed discussion of ethnic problems in the North Caucasus.

Sergey Shakhray, chairman of the State Committee on Federations and Nationalities Affairs, who had also been scheduled to take part in the news conference, failed to arrive, which, according to Ramazan Abdulatipov, was due to the deputy prime minister's busy workload in connection with preparations for an upcoming summit meeting of CIS heads of states. Russian General Prosecutor Valentin Stepankov, who sat in for him at the news conference, dwelled on the activity of prosecutorial bodies in North Ossetia and Ingushetia.

The main obstacle for the law enforcement bodies in carrying out their functions in that region, according to Stepankov, is the presence of illegal armed groups in both republics and also complete disregard for the resolutions of the Seventh Congress of Russian People's Deputies on disarming them. An additional destabilizing factor, in the opinion of the general prosecutor, is the existence of Dudayev's regime in Chechnya "on whose territory Russian laws are virtually inoperative." Valentin Stepankov admitted that by no means would all of the 1,729 people, whose participation in the illegal activities during the Ossetian-Ingush conflict was proved, be punished. In conclusion he said that the question about the situation in the North Caucasus would be a subject of special examination at one of the subsequent Security Council sessions.

### Moscow Leaflets Urge Expulsion of Caucasus Visitors

*MK1405124093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No 16, 14 May 93 (signed to press 13 May) p 2*

[Mekhman Gafarly report: "National Republican Party of Russia Calls for Mob Action Against Non-Russians"]

[Text] Leaflets of the National Republican Party of Russia that have appeared on Moscow streets call upon Muscovites to turn against non-Russian visitors from the Caucasus. Leaflets with banners: "Internationalism? Well, this is the last refuge of an idiot!!!" are brimming with chauvinist calls, and blaming Chechens, Azeris, Georgians, Ingushes, Meskhetian Turks, and members of other Caucasian races for all Russia's troubles. According to the leaflets' authors, the "blacks" are to blame because they are living better than Russians: Georgians' living standards are better by a factor of more than four, while those of the Azeris are better by a factor of nearly nine. "The Russians today," leaders of the National Republican Party of Russia believe, "have no choice: Either we squash the creeping hydra of our Turkic-Caucasian 'brothers' or it will crush us underfoot with satanic ruthlessness." The leaflet goes on to say that the National Republican Party of Russia "is fighting for the expulsion of the uninvited guests from Russian soil."

By the way, the leaflets with so patently Nazi contents were printed in the well-known Moscow printing shop, the joint-stock company Molodaya Gvardiya, in a print run of no less than 250,000 copies.

### Situation in N. Caucasus Said Under Control

*LD1405130493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1149 GMT 14 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Valeriy Shanayev and Mikhail Shevtsov]

[Text] Vladikavkaz May 14 TASS—According to information received from the press service of the provisional administration here, Ossetian and Ingush representatives today met in the village of Chermen, the Prigorodnyy district of North Ossetia, to discuss a wide range of problems linked with the settlement of the problem of refugees, hostages, and people reported missing. The meeting also explored ways to relax tension in the emergency situation zone.

ITAR-TASS has learned that a fourth meeting of the Ingush People's Extraordinary Congress is to be called in Nazran on May 15. It is expected to discuss the sociopolitical situation in the republic and ways to overcome the crisis.

According to information received from Tskhinvali, South Ossetia has positively received the results of Premier Chernomyrdin's working tour of the Northern Caucasus. According to Torez Kulumbekov, speaker of the South Ossetian Parliament, his republic was gradually restoring its national economy and hoped to hold out in spite of the difficult situation in South Ossetia, caused by Georgia's economic blockade. "The people of South Ossetia highly appreciate the Russian Government's assistance, which is being rendered through various channels," he stated.

### Regional Officials, Shakhray Discuss Constitution

*LD1705200493 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1800 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] A regional conference was held in Ryazan today of the heads of administration of 13 main Russian oblasts and representatives of the president. Drafts of a new constitution were discussed. Alevtina Tarasova reports from Ryazan.

[Tarasova] Speaking about the positive points in Oleg Rumyantsev's draft constitution, many participants in the conference noted that this draft is unfinished, cumbersome, and less viable, and does not define the ways to extricate ourselves from the crisis. In contrast, the presidential draft is more precise and balanced, it supports the integrity of the Russian state, takes into account the interests of its subjects, and strictly outlines the work of all the branches of power. Although the participants in the meeting—who supported the main provisions of the draft—generally favored the draft, they said it needs more work.

Oblast representatives tabled some of their amendments to the presidium of the conference. A heated debate was held on the issue of how the new constitution is to be adopted. Sergey Shakhray [chairman of the State Committee for Nationalities Policy] said in his speech that there are three ways of adopting it: by a Congress of People's Deputies, with the observance of certain procedures, as the congress has lost the legal right to act on its own; a constituent assembly may adopt a constitution, and after his victory in the referendum the president has the right to convene it; and as a last resort the fate of the future constitution may be decided by a nationwide referendum.

When adopting their statement, the participants in the conference said in the document that in the present political conditions the adoption of constitutional decisions cannot be the exclusive right of a Congress of People's Deputies. For the purpose of speedily overcoming the constitutional crisis, they recommend that the Russian president convene a constitutional or constituent assembly this July in order to finish work on and adopt the country's new constitution. In their statement they address heads of administration of other oblasts with the request to support them in this decision.

### Regional Leaders Support Yeltsin's Draft Constitution

*MK1805094693 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 May 93 p 1*

[Unattributed report published in the "Document" rubric: "Northwestern Executive Authorities Favor Presidential Draft Constitution. Statement by Participants in Conference of Heads of Executive Bodies of Russian Federation's Northwestern Regions"]

[Text] NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA No. 89 published a statement by leaders of the Supreme Soviets of 11 Russian republics on the president's draft constitution. Yesterday Buryatia parliament chairman Leonid Potapov also signed the document. Later, we received the text of a statement by executive branch heads of Russia's northwestern region. It was signed by heads of administrations and representatives of the Russian Federation president in Arkhangelsk, Vologda, Kaliningrad, Leningrad, Murmansk, Novgorod, and Pskov Oblasts, the mayor of St. Petersburg, the chairman of the Karelian Council of Ministers, and the deputy chairman of the Komi Republic Council of Ministers.

Having discussed the problems involved in the implementation of constitutional reform in the Russian Federation, the participants in the conference agreed that the main obstacle to the emergence of a new Russian statehood is the dual power situation that has now taken shape. Overcoming the dual power situation and preserving Russia's integrity today can be achieved only by peaceful means, based on the foundations of a constitutional system, primarily the power of the people, federalism, and human rights.

The necessity of adopting a new constitution, which would lay down the fundamental principles in all spheres of state and public life, is absolutely obvious. It is likewise obvious that the new constitution of the Russian Federation must be adopted in the very near future.

While generally supporting the text of the constitution as proposed by the Russian Federation president and assessing it as a document that has incorporated the fundamental provisions of all the drafts that were proposed earlier, the conference participants noted the need to rework some of its individual provisions and norms. In particular, it is necessary to separate more clearly the powers between the governmental bodies of the Russian Federation's components and the local bodies of self-government. It is also necessary to provide for additional mechanisms to ensure the stability of the constitutional process.

Specific remarks on the text of the draft will be presented by the Federation's components before 20 May.

The procedures and time frame for the adoption of the new Russian constitution are of special importance. It is the common opinion of the conference participants that this process must be legitimate. It was noted that in the current political conditions the making of constitutional

decisions may not be the exclusive prerogative of the Congress of People's Deputies.

With a view to ensuring the speediest possible overcoming of the constitutional crisis, the conference participants recommend that the president of the Russian Federation convene a constitutional assembly in June to discuss, finalize, and adopt the new constitution of the Russian Federation. Taking part in the work of the constitutional assembly should be delegated on an equal basis: representatives of the Russian Federation's components, representatives of the federal legislative and executive branches of power, and political parties and movements.

The conference participants are addressing the Russian Federation president with a proposal to organize a broad discussion and explanation of the basic provisions of the proposed draft constitution. We appeal to the heads of the executive branch and to the bodies of the representative branch of government in other regions of the Russian Federation to support the initiative of the heads of administrations and presidential representatives of the northwestern region of the Russian Federation, to hold similar conferences, and to discuss and support the present draft fundamental law proposed by the president of Russia.

Reiterating the necessity of a peaceful transition to the implementation of a new stage of state transformations and emphasizing the need to observe the basic principles of the constitutional system, the participants in the conference urge the president of the Russian Federation to carry out constitutional reform immediately.

## Kuzbass Threatens Reprisals for Penalizing Russian Soldiers

*LD1705213193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2100 GMT 17 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo May 18 TASS—Chief of the Kemerovo Regional Council Aman Tuleyev sent a telegram to Azeri leader Abulfaz Elchibey saying there will be no guaranteed deliveries of goods from coal-mining Kuzbass to Azerbaijan unless the Russian soldiers sentenced to death there are allowed to face the trial in Russia for deserting the Russian Army to get involved in the Azeri-Armenian armed conflict.

Aman Tuleyev said politicians should be brought to account ahead of the fellows whom they sent to the conflict zone with gun in their hands. Tuleyev insisted on suspending the capital punishment and appealed for support to the heads of local governments agencies, members of the Siberian Concord Alliance.

## Kemerovo Official Expresses Concern Over Rutskoy Visit

*LD1705131493 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1100 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Aleksandr Altengott, deputy head of the Kemerovo Oblast Administration, today expressed concern that a trip by Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy to Kuzbass, which is scheduled for the beginning of June, may destabilize the accord that has been reached in the region between the representative and executive branches of power. Speaking to journalists, he stressed that the purpose of Aleksandr Rutskoy's visit is also unclear, because Rutskoy has no instructions from the president.

Touching on the vice president's activities as leader of the country's agrarian sector, Aleksandr Altengott noted that Aleksandr Rutskoy has not had any vital positive influence on this sector of the economy.

## Oblast Administration Personnel Changes Reported

*PM1805092193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 May 93 First Edition p 1*

[Unattributed "News Item"]

[Text] By edict of the Russian Federation president, Nikolay Pavlovich Yudin has been relieved of execution of the duties of head of the Orel Oblast administration in connection with the expiration of his powers (Article 17, Point 2 of the Russian Federation Labor Law Code).

By edict of the Russian Federation president, Valeriy Petrovich Fateyev has been relieved of the post of head of the Smolensk Oblast administration in connection with the expiration of his powers (Article 17, Point 2 of the Russian Federation Labor Law Code).

By edict of the Russian Federation president, Albert Arkadyevich Krivchenko has been relieved of the post of head of the Amur Oblast administration in connection with the expiration of his powers (Article 17, Point 2 of the Russian Federation Labor Law Code).

By edict of the Russian Federation president, Vladimir Aleksandrovich Barabanov has been relieved of the post of head of the Bryansk Oblast administration in connection with the expiration of his powers (Article 17, Point 2 of the Russian Federation Labor Law Code).

By edict of the Russian Federation president, Aleksandr Andreyevich Kondratyev has been relieved of the post of head of the Penza Oblast administration in connection with the expiration of his powers (Article 17, Point 2 of the Russian Federation Labor Law Code).

By edict of the Russian Federation president, Yuriy Stepanovich Bugayev has been appointed head of the Russian Federal Service for the Supervision of Insurance Activity.

By directive of the Russian Federation president, Grigoriy Alekseyevich Nikandrov has been appointed the Russian Federation president's representative in Amur Oblast.

## International Affairs

### Delegations Work Out Recommendations on Black Sea Fleet

*LD1305165793 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 14 May 93*

[Text] The press center of our Ministry of Foreign Affairs reported that the state delegation of Ukraine at negotiations with the Russian Federation on issues of the division of the Black Sea Fleet had held its routine session headed by Vasyl Durdynets, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Council of Ukraine.

The course of the preparation of documents on solving complex problems around the Black Sea Fleet were discussed. Possible steps to achieve progress at the negotiations were also considered.

In connection with the fact that the Yalta agreement on the Black Sea Fleet virtually is not being implemented, recommendations to rectify this situation were worked out.

### Republican Party Statement on Relations With Russia

*AU1505192493 Kiev NARODNA HAZETA in Ukrainian No. 18 (99), May 93 p 2*

["Statement by the Fourth Congress of the Ukrainian Republican Party on Relations Between Ukraine and Russia" adopted in Kiev on 2 May]

[Text] The relations between Ukraine and Russia constitute an international problem. The fate of Europe and of the whole world will depend on how they develop. Yevhen Konovalets, prominent figure in Ukrainian national movement, wrote: "For as long as there is no independent Ukrainian state, there will be no order in Europe." It is precisely an independent and strong Ukrainian state that is a guarantor of stability on the European Continent, and it is precisely Ukraine, situated between Russia and Western Europe, that must become an insurmountable obstacle to Moscow's expansionism.

The Ukrainian Republican Party supports democratic and anticommunist forces in Russia. It depends upon their unity and decisiveness whether Russia will pursue the course of civilized reforms or whether it will again fence itself off from the free world by the red-brown Kremlin wall. However, historical experience shows that no matter what political forces prevail in Russia, their attitude to Ukraine has remained unchanged to this day. Russian rulers have always looked upon Ukraine as their own private colonial domain. Even now, having concluded a treaty with Ukraine as with an independent and equal state, Russia cannot reconcile itself to the new reality and, without resorting to direct aggression, continues putting increasing political, economic, and military pressure upon Ukraine.

Some Russian politicians voice, with open cynicism, their claims upon Ukraine. "Either Ukraine unites with Russia again, or there will be war" [preceding sentence published in Russian], says Russian parliamentarian Baburin. In the opinion of [Vice President] Rutskoy, Ukrainian statehood will collapse, and Russia will be instrumental in this. Russia's ambassador in Ukraine Smolyakov openly calls Ukraine's independence "a transient phenomenon."

We are witnessing constant violations by Russia of the agreements it signed. In particular, this is the situation regarding the Black Sea Fleet whose ships, contrary to the Yalta and Dagomys agreements, are used by Russia for resolving its own problems and, unfortunately, in the undeclared war against Georgia. The Ukrainian Republican Party condemned these agreements as contradicting Ukraine's national interests. The subsequent development of events fully confirmed the correctness of our conclusions.

Russia is particularly actively using the CIS as an instrument for the creation of a new empire. Attempts to impose the CIS statutes upon Ukraine, statutes that would virtually deprive our state of its independence, are a manifestation of such a trend.

The Ukrainian Republican Party, as a political force in Ukraine, will promote harmonious and good-neighborly relations between Ukraine and Russia and will strive to achieve mutual understanding and accord between them, but it will at the same time defend in a most decisive manner Ukraine's sovereignty and will make every effort to establish an independent Ukrainian state for centuries to come, contrary to all chauvinist encroachments.

### Shipping Company Demands Action Over UN Sanctions Losses

*LD1705170993 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] The administration of the Ukrainian-Danube Shipping Company has demanded the immediate intervention of the Ukraine Ministry of Foreign Affairs because Ukraine continues to suffer enormous losses as a result of the UN Security Council's sanctions against Yugoslavia. The shipping company's river fleet has stopped, and now import and export cargoes are not being transported to other countries of the basin. Romanian customs officers have practically blocked the movement of convoys to [word indistinct] and other directions.

### * Ukraine's Ethnic Hungarian Minority Expands Activities

#### * Meeting With Deputy Secretary

*93CH0629X Uzhhorod IGAZ SZO in Hungarian 17 Apr 93 p 1*

[Unattributed report: "The Chairman of the KMKSZ in Ukraine's Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Before Significant Steps"]

[Text] On Tuesday afternoon, Ukraine's First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Mikola Makarevich received

in his Kiev office KMKSZ [Cultural Federation of Subcarpathian Hungarians] Chairman Sandor Fodo. At the meeting, which materialized at the host's initiative, special emphasis was put on issues concerning the situation of Subcarpathian Hungarians and Ukrainian-Hungarian relations. In connection with the latter, Sandor Fodo said that the KMKSZ has a vested interest in closer relations between the two countries, and that he wants to play an active role in that.

Fodo expressed his satisfaction regarding the Ukrainian national minority law, which corresponds to European standards, guaranteeing for the minorities both the establishment of cultural autonomy and the use of native tongues and national symbols. But he also mentioned a deficiency [in the law], namely, that the practical application of these rights is only possible where minorities constitute the majority. The KMKSZ is of the opinion that the law would completely fulfill expectations only if it were based not on majority but on the ratio of Hungarians in Subcarpathia's entire population. He also pointed out to the deputy minister that the KMKSZ will exercise its legal rights and will take significant steps this year toward implementing cultural autonomy. Mikola Makarevich assured Fodo of his unqualified support.

### * Hungarian Scientific Association

*93CH0629Y Uzhhorod IGAZ SZO in Hungarian 17 Apr 93 p 1*

[Article by Csilla Fedinec: "The Hungarian Scientific Association of Subcarpathia Has Been Formed"]

[Excerpt] "The Subcarpathian Scientific Association will be formed today for scientifically serving and protecting Subcarpathian and Ruthenian cultural interests and values. It is not my task today to evaluate its significance from the aspects of language and local culture and science, but I believe that everyone is aware of this event's importance. (...) Although long overdue, it is only now that this Subcarpathian and Ruthenian cultural and spiritual fortress is being established, destined to accomplish a mission that is great even from the aspect of the—correctly interpreted—Hungarian ideal of St. Stephen." These were the words with which Knight Miklos Kozma, Subcarpathia's second governor's commissioner, greeted the participants of the Subcarpathian Scientific Association's statutory meeting more than half a century ago, on 26 January 1941. Antal Hodinka was the first chairman of the association.

Although that association was abolished in 1944, it conducted important activities during those few wartime years. That was the model for the Ungvar [Uzhhorod] Center for Hungarology when they decided to create an organization that would unify and support the region's intellectuals committed to science.

The statutory meeting of the Hungarian Scientific Association of Subcarpathia [KMTT] took place on 14 April 1993 in the Center for Hungarology where the bylaws presented by the planning committee were accepted. It is stated in the bylaws, among other things, that the KMTT's mission is to work out and implement humanistic and scientific programs, to be engaged in publishing activities (publishing scientific works, textbooks, and methodological information), and to organize scientific activities.

During the meeting, Peter Lizanec was elected chairman of the KMTT. Zoltan Fabry and Sandor Almassy were elected deputy chairmen. [passage omitted]

Emil Szemrad's proposal that, in addition to its scientific activity, the association should also develop a club life in order to have an exchange of information and to have members get to know each other and the research areas better, met with unanimous approval at the statutory meeting. The Center for Hungarology was designated as the location for these informal meetings on the first Thursday of each month. The first meeting will take place on 6 May at 1600 hours local time.

Those who wish to take part in the activities of the Hungarian Scientific Association of Subcarpathia as active members, should contact the KMTT at the address of the Center for Hungarology (12 Var Street).

### * Hungarian Children's Association

*93CH0629Z Uzhhorod IGAZ SZO in Hungarian 3 Apr 93 p 1*

[Unattributed article: "The Subcarpathia 'Pro Patria' Discoverers' Federation Was Formed"]

[Excerpt] *The statutory meeting of the Subcarpathia "Pro Patria" [For the Country] Discoverers' Federation took place a few days ago in Beregszasz [Beregovo]. Its bylaws were approved, and its presidium, secretariat, and control committee were elected. Erika Kovacs, teacher at Beregszasz's District 3 High School, was elected chairman of the federation.*

Ethnologist Brigitta Baksa, head of the Hungarian "Pro Patria" Federation's division which is responsible for preserving traditions, told our correspondent that the organization was formed three years ago in Hungary, and its most important task is to learn about the fatherland and to discover and preserve its historical, cultural, and folk traditions. Its members organize excursions, hikings, and expeditions to sites of important Hungarian historical events, e.g., most recently, to locations connected with the Kuruc uprising of Ferenc Rakoczi II or the Hungarian freedom fight of 1848-49. Its traveling student division organizes visits to the memorial places of Hungarian literature's great figures. The children, under the Division of Arpad's People, visited the Verecke Pass. [passage omitted]

Children from age 9 may apply for admission to the Subcarpathia "Pro Patria" Discoverers' Federation.

The "Pro Patria" Federation is an apolitical youth organization for the preservation of national traditions. Unlike the Boy Scout Federation, it is secular and, thus, neutral toward religions. Its members wear gray jackets and blue scarfs tied around the neck with a ring and embellished with the Federation's emblem of two elks facing each other. At their admission, members of the Federation take an oath and pledge.

Brigitta Baksa said that the Subcarpathia "Pro Patria" Discoverers' Federation will be an independent organization but may expect, of course, all the help from the organization in the mother country. Following official registration, it will function as an independent legal person.

The program presented at the statutory meeting by students of Beregszasz's District 3 High School created a nice atmosphere; in it, poems by Petofi were recited and nice Hungarian folksongs were sung.

The first members of the Subcarpathia "Pro Patria" Discoverers' Federation took the oath and pledge in a ceremony that took place prior to the general meeting. Jozsef Rako, chairman of the Hungarian "Pro Patria" Federation, presented the school children with a troop flag.

([From] our correspondent)

## National Affairs

### Kuchma Interviewed on Government's Economic Program

*AU1805110693 Kiev URYADOVYY KURYER in Ukrainian 15 May 93 pp 1, 3*

[Interview with Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma by correspondents Mykola Makhinchuk and Leonid Samsonenko; place and date not given: "Leonid Kuchma: 'Half a Year Is Too Little To Achieve Success'"]

[Text] [URYADOVYY KURYER] Leonid Danylovych, the period of extraordinary powers granted by the Supreme Council to the government for stabilizing the situation in the country and for halting the decline in production is expiring. What could and what could not be done for stabilizing the economy? Why?

[Kuchma] It is a difficult task personally for a premier to sum up the activity of the Cabinet headed by him. The work in the first quarter of the current year was summed up at the last meeting of the Cabinet of Ministers. Half a year is a period that is too short even in terms of human life, not to mention the history of a whole state or of its government. The present Cabinet was composed of absolutely new people who needed time for sorting things out and for looking around. Unfortunately, it must be admitted that we had practically no time for doing that. However, it seems to me that, notwithstanding the present situation, the members of the new government must have some feeling of satisfaction. I am not going to strew my head with ashes—in the final analysis, quite a number of things have been done.

It seems to me that the main thing is that outlines have emerged of that legislative power owing to which production is beginning to function. In my opinion, everybody has realized the absurdity of such an approach toward the economy according to which, as we, until quite recently, interpreted the notion "market," everybody can do anything he likes. We became convinced that the state cannot exist without a planning system. The same, incidentally, applies to the family and to its budget.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] In one of the interviews for URYADOVYY KURYER, you said that you were unable to form the team that you wanted. What prevents you from doing this?

[Kuchma] I am sure that you understand very well that it still does not exist and that it will take some time before it emerges. Very much time will be necessary for that. Undoubtedly, for half a year of joint work, I already have an idea about the possibilities of every member of the government. It turns out, however, that it is not enough to just know. If I had worked in the conditions of a plant and if it had depended upon me whom and where to appoint, I would have done this long ago. However, of course, the Cabinet of Ministers is not a plant. Unfortunately, there exist many subjective factors in selecting cadres for the government.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] Your trip to Central Asian countries, more specifically, to Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkmenistan was highly promising. Has it already yielded any practical results?

[Kuchma] Your question is a further development of the first one: What could and what could not be done. Indeed, I gave myself the task of renewing severed ties with all republics of the former Union, as well as with the countries of CEMA. I believe that very much has been done. Without this, we would have been in an even more critical situation.

I can say explicitly: Business partnership relations have been renewed with all Central Asian republics. Observation of the flow of goods to Central Asia shows that it has increased very much from Ukraine. It is only to our advantage, because we receive more from there than we export. This is cotton, copper, and gas. It must be stated, in particular, that, even today, our trade balance with Turkmenistan is rather negative. We still have much work to do on this.

The countries of Central Asia can see the great possibilities that ties with Ukraine offer and are showing interest in developing them. However, this reorientation toward our state, which makes things simpler and easier, has seriously disturbed Russian politicians. This is quite a revealing fact.

Unfortunately, I have not yet managed to visit the Baltic republics, which may constitute a very important economic market for us. The severed ties did no good to either side.

The conference in Surgut was no less encouraging. We only have to fulfill obligations, and there will be oil.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] You have accomplished Ukraine's breakthrough into the Persian Gulf region. What specifically must we do in order to stave off the situation that you characterized in the following words: We went, we saw, and we forgot?

[Kuchma] A delegation from Oman has already been here on a return visit. However, things there are not developing as fast as we would like them to.

I believe that the visit was very important for Ukraine. We are yet to feel its results in the future. This must be one of the main priorities in our external policy. However, we must work more actively in this direction. Both the United States and Russia are attentively watching our efforts.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] Leonid Danylovych, what can you say about the present situation in industry?

[Kuchma] Statistical data on the functioning of our industry in the first quarter are quite reassuring. In particular, from the beginning of the year, the rate of decline in industrial production has been steadily decreasing. While, in January, it constituted 5.7 percent, in March, the figure was just 4.6 percent. Besides, from the beginning of the year, the industrial output decreased by 5.2 percent as compared to 15.3 percent in the first quarter of last year. in the new conditions of economic management, one-third of the total number of enterprises have begun to somewhat increase their output.

Besides, the directors corps' lamentations have become less audible. Everyone is beginning to realize that nobody will do the thinking for him. That is to say, a restructuring of mentality has started. For example, I find it encouraging that many directors are interested in the fate of the decree on corporatization whose action was suspended by the Supreme Council. It is a good symptom. It also seems to me that the majority of the directors have already realized that there is no turning back. That they should not rely upon the state, but cooperate with it. Many of the large enterprises have already asked us to authorize the formation of joint-stock companies on their basis, and so on.

I have been and remain convinced that, in the present situation, the directors' corps must be the main support, because they constitute the force that has an enormous influence upon our society, for reasons that are known to you. In many respects, the fate of reforms depends upon them—whether they go ahead or not.

However, as you see, one hears fewer reprimands from them addressed to the government. Of course, we fully understand that producers are experiencing great difficulties due to the strained mutual relations with Russia and shortcomings in the system of settlements. I want to stress that, for its part, the government has done everything to resolve the existing problems. Unfortunately, the present course that Russia is following toward a closed economic area, more specifically toward reorientating its industry toward national enterprises, does not leave time for Ukraine to engage in lengthy deliberations, but pushes it toward speeding up the restructuring of its industry. Undoubtedly, we will have to resort to both administrative and coercive methods of leadership on this road. In particular, a decree on liberalizing external economic activity is presently being prepared and this is expected to boost the export of Ukrainian goods to markets of all countries. Both the dollar and the ruble constitute hard currency for us today. Besides, we are going to impose appreciable customs duties on imports. It is ridiculous to import everything while we have such enormous reserves of unused potential. Ukraine exports two-thirds of the output of our raw materials, metallurgical, and chemical industries in order to obtain assembly parts. However, we could also manufacture them in our own country!

Russia is now actively reorientating its military-industrial complex toward the needs of its own national economy. There have already been many cases of Russia declining deliveries of Ukrainian products. Therefore, enterprises themselves must realize the fact, which is to a certain extent absurd, that the whole world is advancing toward integration, while we—toward seclusion and isolation. However, we must go through this. The Russian prices of energy resources are driving Ukraine into an impasse and making its products uncompetitive. In particular, on that same Russian market.

I reiterate—one must go through this, and some day we will arrive at normal world prices that will be unlike present artificially distorted ones.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] The creation of decrees has been one of the main instruments in the government's policy. Many of them have influenced the situation and contributed to resolving problems. However, there is an opinion that not all of them have worked.

[Kuchma] I absolutely disagree with such a formulation of the question and do not assume that the decrees have not worked. It is only those whose interests have been, to a certain degree, infringed upon by the interests of the state that can say such a thing. I am deeply convinced that, unless the government had such legislative powers, we would have ruined our economy completely. We will also need such powers in the future, no matter which government takes over, because life does not stand still, and corrections must be efficiently introduced into the legislation. In particular, we have recently adopted a decree "On the System of Currency Regulation and Currency Control" which already needs to be amended. We had certain plans at that time, but changes in

Russia's price policy regarding energy resources have canceled our intentions. Ukraine presently has a negative trade balance with Russia, a balance that constitutes more than 2 trillion rubles. As a result, there have been shortages and a surge in demand.

Of course, we made mistakes in the government's legislative work, but we were not afraid to talk about them. My explanation of them is in the shortage of skilled cadres. We also sometimes succumbed to lobbyism in adopting decrees. Clearly, that was under the pressure of various groups in the parliament, groups that literally prevented us from working. It is no secret if I say that, today, every deputy represents somebody's interests. There is certainly nothing bad about this, but, taking advantage of their powers, they turned into regular pulls who frequently distracted members of the government from engaging in urgent state affairs.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] In your report to the government on 18 May, you are going to ask for an extension of extraordinary powers to enable the continuation of the government's work. Will these powers include the subordination of Ukraine's National Bank and of the State Property Fund to the government?

[Kuchma] This is indisputable. It is not even subject to discussion. The events that we have recently been witnessing explicitly indicate that the National Bank must be subordinated only to the government. As a matter of fact, it is not presently subordinated to anyone at all.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] The standard of living and social attitudes are largely conditioned by the situation in agriculture and in the country. You recently travelled through half of Ukraine in order to learn about the situation in the agro-industrial complex. How do you assess the results of the trip and of the sowing campaign?

[Kuchma] The problems of agriculture are generally known: The shortage of fuel, technology, and so on. Unfortunately, instead of resolving them by joint efforts, the majority of politicians only made noises and intimidated us with a 1993-style famine. However, we managed to complete both plowing and sowing.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] Leonid Danylovych, the situation regarding herbicides is alarming. Having initiated war against the commercial "Ukrahrobiznes" and "Arnika" companies for the monopoly of the state-owned "Ukrahrokhim," the Ministry of Agriculture has failed to provide agricultural workers with sufficient numbers of effective ways of protecting plants, something that will undoubtedly affect the crops....

[Kuchma] If we had started purchasing herbicides through the agency of "Ukrahrokhim," as is being done now, we would have had no problems by now. We were constantly assured that there are many commercial structures to take care of rural residents. This is how they have taken care of them. Nobody is answerable for this. However, the problem was, after all, resolved without much ado and in a quiet manner. As reported by the Ministry of Agriculture, all the sown areas have now been protected and fertilizers have been put on the soil. The only exception is some winter crops, because changes in temperature do not make it possible to complete work there.

The herbicides were, after all, supplied to villages and at much lower prices. Unfortunately, all of this takes place within the framework of the laws that we ourselves have adopted. Myself included. If one sits in the parliament and expresses one's point of view with one's backside, then, once the vote has gone in favor of a particular decision, the deputy is not answerable for anything. Not in any way. Because it is not clear who needs to ask whom for extraordinary powers. Either we should ask the parliament or the parliament should ask us.

Analyzing the results of the tour of the villages, I want to say that I liked the mood prevailing among the villagers very much. There are no oblast committees and no rayon committees, but people are working, villages are being built, and beautiful cottages are emerging.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] Will the state fulfill its obligations to villagers? Because, you must admit, in previous years promises remained on paper....

[Kuchma] Our government did its best to fulfill everything that it had promised. It promised to give them fuel, mineral fertilizers, and herbicides. Our state has fulfilled its obligations, whether in a good or in a bad way. When I made my tour and looked around, I became convinced that we must stop deceiving villagers. This is a sacred matter.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] Leonid Danylovych, we would like to hear your opinion regarding energy sources. Will they be delivered on a regular basis? Does the government intend to develop its national program for searching for energy sources directly in Ukraine?

[Kuchma] Speaking about energy sources on the national scale, the greatest problem is the one associated with financial settlements. Today, we have a negative balance of payments in our settlements with Russia. Moreover, Ukraine is now unable to make up an objective balance of payments, because we do not know about the actual movement of goods. Only those material resources are taken into account that, in their movement, pass through the State Committee. Unfortunately, the government does not have a distinct picture of the commodities movement through customs houses, because there are still no real customs houses. Nor is there any system that enables us to account for the movement of the capital.

The approximate amounts of what we have suggest that we are dealing with an enormous negative balance. Primarily, as a result of the distorted prices of energy sources, the monopolism in the activity of Russian enterprises, and the artificially established rate of the ruble with regard to the Ukrainian karbovanets. That is why a priority task is to ask Russia to provide long-term credits. At least, one trillion [rubles]. Besides, we need

close economic ties as we need air to breathe; because the policy of confrontation will not lead to anything. However, our plants' workload is only 30 percent, but we are not dismissing workers. Perhaps we should have shares in oil-producing areas. Because, today, the Russian ruble is the same hard currency as the dollar. If we do invite foreign investors to invest their capital in Ukraine's economy, this does not preclude the activity of Russian investors.

As regards the development of the national program for the development of the production of energy sources, the government is all for this. However, for all of this, we also need colossal investments. Unfortunately, we do not have them. That is why we must think about more efficient ways to attract foreign businessmen. First and foremost, from the countries of the Near East, where there is free capital. Because, in Europe, we cannot obtain them at a state level and, for known reasons, private capital does not yet flow into Ukraine.

Besides, we need to conduct, as fast as we can, a restructuring of the economy. We need to implement a most stringent program for saving energy sources, to give up energy-intensive technologies, and to modify tHe people's mentality with regard to a thrifty economy. We must begin even now to prepare our national economy for winter and to introduce restrictions on energy consumption.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] What can you say about price stabilization? People are again expecting yet another hike....

[Kuchma] There is no need to expect it, because it is under way. We could not control retail prices. A corresponding governmental decree was issued. By 7 May, we prepared a bulky package of documents on the social protection of the population. We also planned to revise retail prices.

I understand that everybody is concerned about this question. I am also concerned about it, but, at present, I do not see any real way out of the situation, since price intervention develops from outside. Nor is there enough money for subsidies.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] The social protection of the population was one of the priority trends in the government's policy. However, how can anyone protect the population, given such a crisis in the economy and such a budget deficit?!

[Kuchma] My position here is that, with the consent of society, it was necessary to pursue a more stringent social policy. Subsidies must only be given to those who cannot work. Unless we understand this, there will be no better protection. Things will not get better if we put more money into circulation. These pieces of paper will only acquire value after commodity producers start working.

The government's task was precisely in stopping the decline in production and in boosting the work of producers, workers in the processing industry, and peasants. We partly managed to do this in the first quarter of the current year. Stabilization has even started in the rate of the coupon, and rubles have already started flowing into Ukraine. However, events of recent weeks indicate that as if heavenly forces have interfered in order to mess up what has been achieved.... I am still unable to sort out what is behind this.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] The Democratic Party proposes that an emergency situation be introduced in Ukraine for two years. What is your attitude to this?

[Kuchma] Positive. An analysis of the situation shows that two years is a minimal period of time for achieving stabilization. Even though last year, when I was taking the post of head of the government, I said that it was possible to stabilize the situation faster. I am deeply convinced: That is how it was. Unfortunately, this does not only depend upon the premier. Who could foresee at that time that prices of energy sources would rise a hundredfold?!

[URYADOVYY KURYER] Leonid Danylovych, even in the corridors of the Cabinet one hears talks that vice prime minister Viktor Pynzenyk committed follies in Ukraine's economic policy....

[Kuchma] I do not agree with this. Even if there have been some mistakes, it is not the fault of one person. Do not forget that almost 1,000 persons work at the Ministry of the Economy headed by Pynzenyk and that there are nine deputy ministers. If someone does not find a common language with Viktor Mykhaylovych, there is also the prime minister and the Cabinet of Ministers. Go ahead and say what you do not agree with. Instead, what we are dealing with is a knock-out game.

I reiterate: Even if mistakes were made, they were, first and foremost, the responsibility of the government headed by the prime minister. I am primarily answerable for everything that takes place in the Cabinet of Ministers.

[URYADOVYY KURYER] You recently stated at a parliament session that the question of strengthening the vertical managerial structure and eliminating parallel executive structures needs to be resolved at a legislative level....

[Kuchma] Parallelism in any of its forms never did any good to anyone, but, on the contrary, it only led to losses, by generating an attitude of collective irresponsibility. The sooner we get rid of it the better.

## Armenia

### Spokesman on CIS Integration, Tripartite Meeting

*NC1705183993 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Presidential Press Secretary Aram Abrahamyan held a news conference at the Armenian president's residence today. It was devoted to the latest summit meeting of CIS presidents, to economic and political relations between Armenia and Russia, and to the tripartite mediation effort by the United States, Russia, and Turkey.

In assessing the outcome of the 14 May summit of the CIS leaders, the press secretary noted that the previous centrifugal forces in CIS countries have been replaced by practical and [word indistinct] principles, and all the countries are pleased with the closer economic ties and with the need to coordinate these ties.

The press secretary pointed to the importance of the document adopted at the summit on the creation of an economic union, and stressed that Armenia is actively participating in the increasingly broadening integration processes taking place within the CIS. Citing the EC as an example, Abrahamyan emphasized that the creation of a CIS economic union fully precludes any attempt to diminish the sovereignty and independence of the member states.

Touching upon the economic and political ties between Armenia and Russia, the press secretary said that the Armenian leadership had a number of important meetings in Moscow with Russian leaders during which various problems pertaining to economic cooperation between the two countries were examined. He stressed the importance of the state credit Russia has granted to Armenia. Thanks to this, Armenia will be able to substantially improve its economic situation in the next three to four years.

Abrahamyan announced that during his Moscow contacts, President Levon Ter-Petrosyan met Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. In his turn Armenian Prime Minister Grant Bagratyan met with Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and Deputy Prime Minister Oleg Lobov. They discussed many issues of mutual concern.

The presidential press secretary also underlined the importance of the meetings between the Armenian president and Foreign Minister Vahan Papazyan and Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev. They discussed the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict and matters relating to the resolution of the Karabakh problem.

Referring to the dynamic diplomatic activity in connection with the tripartite mediation effort, Abrahamyan said that the initiators of the tripartite mediation held a meeting [in Moscow] on 14 and 15 May. Mario Sica, cochairman of the CSCE's Minsk Group, took part in this meeting. The meeting discussed the proposals made by Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh to clarify the tripartite plan. The results of the meeting will be published soon. In addition to the tripartite plan, the sides will produce an appendix in which important matters pertaining to the mediation effort will be clarified. In this connection, Abrahamyan stressed the importance of the meeting the Armenian president and foreign minister held with the Russian president's ambassador on special missions Vladimir Kazimirov.

In summing up, Abrahamyan noted that the next summit of CIS leaders is scheduled to take place in Yerevan on 16 July. According to Abrahamyan, this fact is an indication of the growing prestige enjoyed by Armenia and particularly by its president.

After his statement, Abrahamyan replied to reporters' questions.

### Views Outcome of Negotiations With Russia

*LD1805101093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0839 GMT 18 May 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan May 18 TASS—The Armenian president's representative has highly appraised the negotiations which were held between the Armenian president and prime minister and leaders of the Russian Federation.

Aram Abrahamyan, the Armenian president's press secretary said in an interview with ITAR-TASS that the results of these meetings lead to a conclusion that Russia is ready to develop cooperation with Armenia in all spheres. He also confirmed Yerevan's interest in such cooperation.

The Armenian president's representative noted the exceptional importance of the financial and economic agreements signed between the Russian Federation and Armenia, in particular one document stating that the republic's debt for last year and the first months of this year become a Russian state credit.

These documents will be a boost to the economy and people of Armenia in the present crisis situation, said the press secretary. In his words "Russia is now one of Armenia's most important partners."

## Azerbaijan

### Presidential Spokesman Comments on Moscow Talks

*NC1705152993 Baku TURAN in English 1358 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Baku, May 17 (TURAN)—As known the representatives of the United States, Russia and Turkey

meeting on the problems concerning the realization of tripartite peaceful initiative of these countries was held in Moscow on May 14-15.

Today at briefing of Azerbaijan president staff the head of the press-service of the president Arif Aliyev informed that during the meeting some additions to the plan of settlement of Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict were approved. These additions are concerned with the dates of the realization of the tripartite plan. According to Aliyev Azerbaijan will express its attitude of these additions after their detailed study.

Speaking about the position of Armenia the press-secretary noted that Yerevan endlessly lays down conditions concerning the realization of the UN SC [Security Council] Resolution N 822 and tripartite initiative. These actions are propaganda screen. Armenian policy is directed to the delay and break-down of the peacemaking efforts of the world community with an aim to satisfy the expansion plans.

### Court Offical Sees No Reason To Release Russian Soldiers

*NC1705152393 Baku TURAN in English 1358 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Baku, 17 May (TURAN)—The chairman of the Military Board of the Supreme Court of Azerbaijan Shahin Rustamov announced today that Yeltsin's appeal to Elchibey with a request to give six Russian service men to Russia is groundless. According to Rustamov there is no judicial reason to give accused soldiers. "The matter is a pardon for accused men but it is a prerogative of the president of Azerbaijan," Rustamov stressed.

He also noted that one day Azerbaijan gave Russia Lieutenant Lukin accused for murder of three people in Baku. However after that a criminal case of Lukin was canceled and there appeared publications in mass media acquitted Lukin's actions.

### Elchibey Sends Congratulations to Turkey's New President

*NC1705192693 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 17 May 93*

["Text" of congratulatory telegram from President Abulfaz Elchibey to Turkish President Suleyman Demirel; date not given—read by announcer]

[Text] Mr. Suleyman Demirel, I wholeheartedly congratulate you on the occasion of your election as the president of Turkey. I wish you sound health, happiness, and success in your untiring efforts for the exaltation of all Turkish people. Your work and political activity, to which you have dedicated your life, have made you a great and global politician and the founder and standard-bearer of the Turkic world.

Mr. Demirel, you have a special place in the hearts of the Turkic people of Azerbaijan. Your support for our people and for the improvement of democracy in Azerbaijan is worthy of the highest praise. I am fully confident that as the president of Turkey you will hoist the banner of Turks on higher peaks and be the friend, brother, and steadfast supporter of all the Turkic peoples.

I kiss and embrace you on behalf of Azerbaijan's people.

## Georgia

### Shevardnadze Interviewed on Relations With Russia

*LD1705093793 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0500 GMT 17 may 93*

[Studio interview with Head of State Eduard Shevardnadze by unidentified reporter—live]

[Text] [Reporter] Mr. Shevardnadze, just when the hope of settling the Abkhaz conflict emerged, Sukhumi was bombed again. Before setting off to Moscow, you commented on the Kutaisi incident, saying that Russian military men could have avoided the bloodshed and that somebody wanted to disrupt the talks. Going back to these two incidents, one is left with an impression that the Russian armed forces are not acting in coordination with the Russian authorities, at least, not in connection with Georgia.

[Shevardnadze] Good morning. There are many hindering factors balking the way to what is called good-neighborly and good relations between Russia and Georgia. There are such forces in the Russian society. I have mentioned this many times. These are quite powerful forces, and unfortunately there are such forces in Georgia, too. As for the incident in Kutaisi, it must be a linking thread of this general flow of disruption.

I remember, as I was working together with my colleagues at the embassy [in Moscow], a picket of 20-25 people was formed outside, headed by Mr. Zhirinovskiy. His passionate words and slogans were directed against the normal and good-neighborly relations between Russia and Georgia. There are people in Georgia who hold the same views as Zhirinovskiy, but from a different angle. But I must say one thing—and I hope that my people will support me in this—I have finally decided to take care of and fight to the very end for improving Russo-Georgian relations and to make them healthy again. Otherwise, I cannot imagine how it will be.

We have done much toward establishing good, kind relations with Turkey, our brotherly Armenia, our brotherly Azerbaijan, Iran, Ukraine; there are many other steps we intend to take in future, and it would be irresponsible to ignore the Russian factor. This would be Quixotesque policy and would not remain unpunished.

[Reporter] This process of talks has dragged on. I remember that Mr. Yeltsin intended to visit Tbilisi right after the 11 October elections.

[Shevardnadze] It became difficult due to some causes, but the process is still going on and, in my opinion, the Moscow meeting was one of the most important events.

[Reporter] At the meeting in Moscow, an issue of a cease-fire and pulling out hardware and artillery from the frontline was discussed. Yesterday, Mr. Tengiz Kitovani [former Georgian defense minister] stressed on Georgian television that withdrawing hardware and artillery from Sukhumi would practically mean losing Sukhumi. After the Gagra tragedy, we must rule out even a slight doubt that it may happen again, otherwise there is no use in reaching any agreement.

[Shevardnadze] I listened to his comment on the Moscow meeting, which was transmitted on Georgian television and radio, and also reported in the press. I think that the fear and alarm voiced by some people are totally groundless. Unfortunately, a simple approach to such issues prevails in some prominent people's comments. The Moscow meeting results are sometimes viewed from the point of view of an angry man, although I must say that there were no principal disagreements between Mr. Kitovani's and my viewpoints on relations with Russia. Sometimes it is said that I was to blame in not being able to establish good relations with Russia. As I told you, I have always supported and still support our need for normal relations with this big country. As for withdrawing hardware, some people must have misinterpreted the issue. Maybe we should have been more precise in some fine points. We have a communique where one cannot write everything, as not everything that has been agreed on can be reflected in a communique. It is not an agreement or a big document—it is just a report about what happened, in general terms. Yeltsin and I discussed a pull-out of hardware.

The pivotal point is to stop the shelling and bombing of towns and villages from land and air, and naturally, in order to guarantee a cease-fire, we must somehow withdraw aircraft from the conflict zone. We are interested in doing this, withdrawing artillery, and in the first place, heavy artillery and those tanks which can open fire at towns and populated areas. This is a clear attitude. These terms concern Abkhaz, Georgian and Russian arms. So there are no hurdles here. That is one thing. Second, the negotiation process is beginning, negotiations between Georgia and Russia. You know that Yeltsin has appointed his personal envoy, Pastukhov, and I will also make a decision today or tomorrow; Grachev has also appointed his envoy, and Mr. Karkarashvili will appoint his envoy; then talks will start and we will define the conflict zone, its geographic space, from where we should withdraw first. maybe we will have stages of withdrawal, but the most important stipulation is a cease- fire beginning 20 May. I cannot see grounds for alarm. Probably, we should have explained things more specifically and in more detail.

Now I would like to say a few words about a negative assessment made by some activists and citizens. I must say that probably some people would have clapped if I put an ultimatum to Yeltsin on a particular issue, say, either you withdraw your troops from this region or else we are at war. This would have been a sensational statement; some circles could have met it with an ovation but such a statement would have been flippant.

[Reporter] It would have had very serious consequences.

[Shevardnadze] Of course. We have set ourselves a goal to normalize relations with Russia and start living side by side peacefully. The road to this goal is thorny and difficult, but we must overcome it and live as good neighbors. I think this aim can be reached. And the key to it lies in Abkhazia. I think that our dialogue, the dialogue between the heads of the two states, started in such a manner that it allows me to see the Abkhaz conflict resolved. I think it is more real now than it seemed at the beginning of September.

[Reporter] At Friday's meeting between the defense ministers [of Georgia and Russia], Karkarashvili raised the issue of a Russian troops withdrawal from Abkhazian territory. How realistic is it that this issue could finally be resolved at the meeting with Yeltsin?

[Shevardnadze] I must say that we discussed this issue at our level, and in principle we agreed.

[Reporter] You mentioned that some details need to be finalized.

[Shevardnadze] Many things have to be finalized in the process of negotiations. We delegated this conversation to our ministers, and in my opinion it is important that Karkarashvili met General Grachev, the defense minister [of Russia] and it was a vitally important dialogue. Mr. Karkarashvili conducted the first, and especially the second meeting, honorably. Probably he will tell you himself what they talked about a bit later on; at the moment it is not necessary. This isuue was discussed in great detail at the meeting. Yeltsin gave his principle consent on the withdrawal of the troops from Esheri, and so did the defense minister. As I told you, the defense minister has already appointed his personal envoy and these experts are to sit together and think. A cease-fire should be a guarantee of any such action. If there is no cease- fire, we cannot talk about the withdrawal of different units, Georgian or Russian, from any zone.

[Reporter] Earlier you mentioned Zhirinovskiy. When picketing your residence in Moscow, Zhirinovskiy said he did not support the idea of reinstating the Soviet Union, but he said they [as heard] should have a unified army and a common foreign policy in order to stop conflicts in the former republics. And if it does not happen, then Turkey and the United States would enter Georgian territory. Actually, Russian activists, warning of a Turkish threat, is not a novelty. I am placing Turkish threat in quotation marks, of course. At the same time they are talking of Russia and Georgia having the same

religious faith. Russia, being of the same faith as Georgia, has not been less calamitous than in its time was Persia or the Ottoman empire. Where on your list of priorities do you put the religious factor when defining political priorities in connection with Georgia?

[Shevardnadze] Every factor should be taken into consideration in politics. Unfortunately, it cannot be always be done. But I do not think that the religious factor is the decisive one. I do not think that we should attach a pivotal importance to the religious factor when dealing with foreign or domestic policy. Times are different now, we are living in a different era, that is one thing; second, Georgia is an excellent example of religious tolerance and coexistence. Christianity, Islam, Catholicism, the Gregorian Church have existed in Georgia for such a long time; the Jews have lived in Georgia for 26 centuries. All these have lived, are still living and will continue to do so in future. It is not a problem for us.

I cannot see a real danger coming from Turkey as well as from other neighbors. Maybe there will be some difficulties between the neighbors, but I am ruling out any large-scale conflicts given that the policy is right. This argument sounds similar to those claims of some activist in Georgia concerning Russia's strategic interests in Georgia.

By the way, I must confess to the radio listeners that I raised the issue with Yeltsin that some of the Russian representatives were claiming that Russia had strategic interests in Georgia. I told Yeltsin: Well, here we are, the two of us. Let us clarify what strategic interests of Russia there are in Georgia. In my opinion, Yeltsin's explanation was quite right. First, he said that we should take no heed of it as every activist held different views. But the president and the Russian leadership view their strategic interests in Georgia as follows: If Georgia is going to be friendly and kindly disposed toward Russia, if genuinely good-neighborly relations are established between the two countries, and if Georgia is not militant toward Russia, then this is what Russia's strategic interests are. By the way, Yeltsin said the Russians are interested in Georgia having a unified and strong army, and that they are ready to render help in that respect, as well as to revive our economy.

I must also stress that we talked a lot about the situation facing scientists in Russia and Georgia. If we do not normalize relations with Russia, notwithstanding good prospects of relations with Germany, the United States, and other countries, our science will collapse, degenerate, and we will find ourselves in terrible difficulties in 10-15 years' time. So all those calls from Zhirinovskiys, our fellow compatriots, and the people who hold the same views, are groundless.

[Reporter] Thank you. Last week, the parliament discussed the draft resolution on dividing Georgia into territorial and administrative districts. It sparked off differences in views in the parliament. Probably it would have sparked off larger-scale differences in viewpoints among the population if it were not for the war in Abkhazia. Do you think the timing is right for raising this issue now? How do you see Georgia divided into territorial and administrative districts?

[Shevardnadze] I think the timing is perfect and the issue is pressing. There is a new idea of creating districts [words indistinct]. How the authors of this project see it, must be discussed later. Personally, I expressed my viewpoint at the parliament session, saying that in the interests of the unity of state, its integrity, especially at this transitional level, the emergence of such a new, powerful, state body in the management system, will be a certain guarantee for stability and unity. If it is difficult to make a decison on this issue in the parliament, then meybe we will turn to the population for help. I must say that we must appeal to the population for their viewpoints.

[Reporter] Do you mean a referendum?

[Shevardnadze] No, not a referendum. We must work out a more precise way of collecting public viewpoints. We must have more accurate data, and it is possible. In western countries they have a system enabling one to give a point of view of the majority of the population. I have decided to find a form of address and ask the population to express their attitude toward Russo-Georgian relations, as many people are opposing my stance on these relations. The same goes for the project to create districts. I mean, we must explain to the population what is going on and then give them a chance to express their views.

[Reporter] Thank you. Very soon we will be celebrating the day of independence, 26 May. It was a bitter experience; they [as heard] gave us a chance to experience a taste of freedom for 3 years and then we lost it altogether. Probably Georgia will be getting ready to celebrate this day, but sadly, destructive forces are getting ready to exacerbate the situation again.

[Shevardnadze] I think that soon my essay on the importance of this day in Georgian history, and our future struggle for independence, will be published. That is why I will not dwell on it in great detail now. This day must be celebrated despite the war and the hardship. May 26 must be an extraordinary day and an event for the rich and the poor equally. I am sure we will all take to the streets—this will be a legal march. I do not know yet what shape we will give it, whether it will be a street demonstration or just a march. We will celebrate the day of Georgia's unity, dialogue and independence, 26 May. It is a sacred date in Georgian history. Not only must we celebrate this day, but also work for the country's future. I call on everybody—management of rayons, ministries and the whole population—let us do good for our country, put our town, its streets, our houses in good order. Let us not forget that it is our country and that we must take care of it and keep it clean. Whatever time allows us to do, let us do it. We only have a week left, but let us clean the streets and celebrate our historic day

properly. This is all I want to say today. I have talked in great detail on this matter. I am not ruling out a decision on the issue of celebrating Independence Day. I will be meeting the defense minister and the minister of interior to consider a parade on 26 May. It will be beautiful. We will try to organize it in good time.

[Reporter] Yesterday you attended a theater performance at the Marjanishvili Theater [in Tbilisi]. The world of poet Vazha-Pshavela has always been close to our hearts, especially today when we can see devotion to our country, and betrayal at the same time—a great love and strong hatred. You called this performance modern and poignant. Did you also mean the finale?

[Shevardnadze] I meant the play as a whole. It is difficult for me to talk about it now. It touched me so much. It was emotionally charged. Vazha-Pshavela is so well known to every Georgian, but a fresh reading always reveals something new, especially when you see words projected on stage and in action. I must say that I am fascinated by the dynamism of the produciton. The production's poignancy is emphasized by the fact that devotion, bravery, knighthood are what we witness every day. I did not think that having seen so much blood on the frontline that this play would affect me with its ending. I met the cast and the creators of this wonderful play yesterday. I told Temur Chkheidze, the director, that if theater is breating now it means that the nation and the country, its people, the state, are alive. This play must be seen by as many people as possible. This play, about awakening. national responsibility, should be the most important trait of our character. I said yesterday that those people who are living now, are historical persons as they are all participating in building independent Georgia. These people, they all have national responsibility before the country.

The problem of betrayal is also of a great importance. I did not want to sign off on this sad note, but this is also a pressing issue.

[Reporter] Thank you very much.

### Reported Buildup of Russian Forces Protested

*LD1805102193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0916 GMT 18 May 93*

[Text] Tbilisi, 18 May (GIA-ITAR-TASS)—Tamaz Nadareishvili, head of government of the autonomous republic of Abkhazia (within Georgia) protested to the Russian ambassador to Georgia "over the buildup of the capacity of Russian troops in the zone of the military conflict."

"According to our information, there has been a buildup of manpower in the last few days along the line of confrontation by the Gumista River. Most of these men are career servicemen of the Russian Federation Armed Forces, who are stationed, incidentally, outside the seismic laboratory of the Russian Federation Defense Ministry," the statement says.

This group was the target of Georgian artillery fire, in response to which the Russian side accused Georgian Armed Forces in firing against the laboratory, the statement says.

The head of government of the autonomous republic of Abkhazia repudiated these allegations, because, according to him, after the Russian-Georgian summit on 14 May, Georgian Armed Forces had not opened fire against the laboratory and undertook to maintain this position.

He warned the Russian ambassador: "In the event of these Russian military units taking actions against armed forces of the Republic of Georgia, we will retaliate using all force and means at our disposal."

### Shevardnadze Appoints Representative to Russia

*LD1805111493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1045 GMT 18 May 93*

[Text] Moscow, 18 May (ITAR-TASS)—Aleksandr Kavsadze, chairman of the human rights and interethnic relations committee of the Republic of Georgia, has been appointed the personal and plenipotentiary representative of parliament speaker Eduard Shevardnadze in contacts with Russia. This decision was prompted by the agreement concerning the appointment of special representatives of Boris Yeltsin and Eduard Shevardnadze to deal with difficulties arising between the two countries—specifically the conflict in Abkhazia—which was adopted at the recent meeting in Moscow of the heads of state of Russia and Georgia.

It has already been reported that Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Boris Pastukhov has been named the special representative of the Russian president.

The appointment of Eduard Shevardnadze's personal representative in contacts with Russia was reported today by the press center of the Georgian Embassy in Russia.

### Ioseliani on Abkhazian Conflict, Russian Involvement

*LD1705232393*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1800 GMT on 17 May carries a 57-minute recorded interview with Jaba Konstantinovich Ioseliani, deputy chairman of the Georgian State Council, by correspondent Andrey Karaulov in Tbilisi on 30 April on the "Moment of Truth" program.

Karaulov asks Ioseliani whether he is a rich man. Ioseliani denies that he is rich. He says he was put in prison for the first time when was 16 years old, but managed to escape two years later. He recalls that he has spent a total of 17 years in prisons. He says he does not think he has changed over the years.

Karaulov next asks Ioseliani's opinion of Eduard Shevardnadze. Ioseliani says Shevardnadze is a modest man. Ioseliani says that Shevardnadze came to where he is from the top, while he—Ioseliani—came to where he is now from the bottom. He adds that this sort of situation was inconceivable 20 years ago.

Karaulov asks whether Ioseliani is in control of the situation. Ioseliani admits that he is not fully in control, but the process of establishing the Army is under way. He says he often visits the front line and is not worried about visiting trouble spots with his son. This is because he has had requests from fathers whose sons were killed to enroll in the Mkhedrioni units and heard their wishes to set a good example of personal bravery.

Asked about the number of casualties on the Georgian side in the Abkhazian war, Ioseliani says: "If we are to include the civilian population as well, then the number is something like 1,000."

Karaulov then asks about casualties on the Abkhazian side.

Ioseliani replies: "To our knowledge, the Abkhazian side has lost something like 2,000. They conceal their casualties. We do not make a secret of ours. We say what is there, and we tell the truth."

Karaulov then asks Ioseliani who or what, in his opinion, could put an end to this bloodshed in Abkhazia.

Ioseliani replies: "If Russia wants, it can put an end to this at once. It should stop helping the Abkhazians, and the war will cease at once. I assure you."

Ioseliani then describes mercenaries of various types who are fighting in Abkhazia, especially Russian servicemen who have no place to go and become mercenaries fighting on the Abkhazian side. He say: "There are Russians fighting in Abkhazia. There were hardly more than 100-200 people armed with automatic weapons in the whole of Abkhazia before this war started; this was all the weapons they had. After six or seven months of fighting, let us look at some intelligence reports by our special services within the last month."

Ioseliani then reads from a sheet of paper: "On 14 October 1992, 15 military infantry personnel carrier vehicles crossed from Russian territory into Abkhazia. On 22 December 1992, 12 railway cars loaded with armored equipment arrived in Gudauta from Sochi. On 25 December, a barge with 500 armed soldiers of Russian, Adygey, and Chechen nationalities on board sailed from Adler to Gudauta. On 23 February of this year, three combat infantry vehicles were delivered to the Abkhazian side at Bombora airport by a Russian military transport plane. On 25 February seven KamAZ trucks—fully loaded with automatic weapons—crossed the Georgian border. On 26 February, a train carrying four bus loads of fully armed Russian servicemen was sent from the Adler station towards Gagry. On 14 March, 17 cisterns of fuel were delivered from Tuapse station to the Abkhazian side for their planned attack on Sukhumi—and so on, and so forth.

"On the instructions of Major General Sigudkin, deputy commander of the Russian Air Assault Troops, a special purpose battalion of up to 450 men arrived at the airport near Gudauta. This contingent did not even try to conceal from anyone around that they arrived to help the Abkhazian side. Each day, an AN-72 airplane—which carries the dead and wounded from Gudauta—takes off from the Chkalov Airdrome near Moscow. These are not just a few individuals. There are dozens of men—which is another proof of the scale of the Russian troop involvement. Every day, dispatches similar to these arrive."

Karaulov asks if Ioseliani is trying to say that Russia is fighting Georgia in Abkhazia. Ioseliani says: "Yes, of course. You understand, it is not an open war as such; it is sort of veiled. It was, at least, until recently. Now, in recent days, they are coming out in the open. They do not even try to conceal it anymore. When I recently met with your Minister Grachev in Sochi and asked him something, he openly said: Well, so what? Yes, we have been bombing. We have our own interests there. What sort of interests are they? Well, he says, we have our dachas, sanatoriums, and so on."

Several Georgian TV video reports are then shown on the situation in Abkhazia.

Ioseliani says there is anarchy in Russia. He recalls how he once witnessed, in Shevardnadze's study, Rutskoy's phone call threatening to bomb Tbilisi because Rutskoy was displeased with something.

Karaulov asks whether the testimony is credible of Russian mercenaries who are prisoners and are claiming mistreatment. Ioseliani says it is occasionally difficult to restrain people who have just taken their enemies captive, but says that Georgia treats its war prisoners humanely.

Ioseliani then denies that Georgia started the war. He says that Abkhazia—Kolkhida—is their common land and that Georgians and Abkhazians have lived on this land for 20 centuries. He says that Abkhazia then introduced its form of apartheid: parliamentary representation was out of all proportion to the ethnic groups living there. He explains that an agreement between Shevardnadze and Ardzinba to protect bridges and roads from attack had been broken and that Ardzinba could not be trusted.

Karaulov asks Ioseliani about the apparent incompatibility between his being a playwright, a linguist, and also a warrior. Ioseliani says this was his fate. Karaulov asks if Ioseliani is not afraid that people returning from the front will infect Georgia with a Vietnam syndrome. Ioseliani replies that war is terrible because people lose their lives and become completely demoralized spiritually. He says that 500,000 Georgians lost their lives

during the last war, but it was someone else's war. He says that for the first time in 200 years this is their own war.

### Iran's Velayati Postpones Visit

*LD1705165893 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1500 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Mahmud Va'ezi, deputy foreign minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who is in Tbilisi for an official visit, has had a meeting in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Georgia. He was received by Georgian Foreign Minister Aleksandr Chikvaydze.

The conversation focused mainly on the forthcoming visit to Georgia by Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati. It is already known that the sides deemed it expedient to postpone for several days the start of the visit by the Iranian foreign minister, which will enable them to improve the documents to be examined and to have a more productive visit.

Georgian Foreign Minister Chikvaydze briefed the deputy foreign minister on the meetings in Moscow between the Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin and Georgian head of state Eduard Shevardnadze, as well as between the heads of the two countries' corresponding agencies.

Va'ezi pointed out that this step, aimed at establishing good-neighborly relations between Russia and Georgia, is seen in a positive way by Iran and that the aforementioned meeting is regarded as a most important event for promoting cooperation between the countries in the Caucasus and neighboring regions, based on the principles of equal rights, territorial integrity, and the inviolability of borders.

The sides examined the situation regarding the implementation of the programs envisaged by the documents signed in Iran at the beginning of this year.

### Foreign Minister, German Envoy Discuss Shevardnadze Visit

*LD1705192493 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1500 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Georgian Foreign Minister Aleksandr Chikvaidze has received Guenter Dalhoff, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Federal Republic of Germany to Georgia.

The main topic of discussion was the upcoming visit to Germany by Georgian state leader Eduard Shevardnadze. The ambassador presented the minister with a preliminary program for the visit to Germany. Certain details were clarified. During the meeting the two also discussed cooperation between the two states and draft agreements on the promotion of bilateral relations to be signed in Germany.

Aleksandr Chikvaidze briefed the ambassador on the results of the meetings between Yeltsin and Shevardnadze, and between the heads of various Russian and Georgian agencies. It was stressed that Germany is firmly committed to the international norms, in particular the principles of state territorial integrity and the inviolability of borders. Therefore, Germany positively assesses the normalization of relations between Russia and Georgia, which received a strong momentum from the recent meeting between the president of the Russian Federation and the head of the Georgian state. The agreements reached at this meeting are to play a very important role in the restoration of peace in Georgia and the Caucasus region as a whole.

## Estonia

### Strobe Talbott Meets President, Prime Minister

*LD1705172293 Tallinn Radio Estonia International Service in Estonian 1400 GMT 15 May 93*

[Text] Strobe Talbott, President Bill Clinton's special envoy in Russia and the CIS states during a visit to Tallinn today, gave a brief news conference in Toompea [seat of government and parliament in Tallinn]. Previously he had meetings with President Lennart Meri, Premier Mart Laar, and other government members as well as with representatives of the Russian community.

Talbott noted that in Estonia's case we are talking about a real life example of the possibility of successful political and economic reform in the former USSR. He affirmed also U.S. support to Estonia on the issue of Russian troop withdrawal.

### President Hails Membership in Council of Europe

*WS1705092893 Tallinn BNS in English 1543 GMT 15 May 93*

[Text] Tallinn, May 15, BNS—A new page has turned in the annals of Estonia, President Lennart Meri said in Friday's televised address to the nation on Estonia's becoming a full member of the Council of Europe.

"We have always considered ourselves Europeans, and Estonia, an European country." But one thing is what we think of ourselves, and it's another matter what Europe thinks of us," the president said.

Meri expressed hope that the cold war by Russia against Estonia has ended. "My friendly hand is extended as before to the Russian democrats and to President Yeltsin, despite the winds of a cold war that have blown in the meantime and the very outdated idea of dividing Europe once again into zones of influence," he said.

The president said that the civic rights are being guaranteed in Estonia and the human rights are valid in the country at least at the same level as in Germany or France, or in Great Britain.

"Integration into Europe is no soup, but a mosaic, where each stone, however small, has its own color," Meri said in response to fears that closer ties with the process European integration might negatively affect the Estonian culture.

### Velliste Says Membership Offers 'Protective Shield'

*WS1705134993 Tallinn BNS in English 1123 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Tallinn, May 17, BNS—Estonia's newfound membership in the Council of Europe offers it a new protective shield, said Foreign Minister Trivimi Velliste. While the foreign minister admits the membership requires Estonia to follow a certain standard to live in the European family, "this family will protect us if necessary," he said.

In addition, he said, the membership, officially granted Friday, offers some security against ungrounded accusations.

"If some country would try accusing us evidently without any grounds for that, we won't have to pay much attention to this and can deal more with our everyday matters," Velliste told reporters after returning from Strasbourg.

The speaker of the Estonian parliament, Ulo Nugis, said Estonia in the near future will have to join all 150 of the Council of Europe conventions.

Despite earlier steps by Russia to postpone Estonia's membership, the head of the Russian delegation congratulated the Estonian delegation its country's full membership in the European body, said Nugis.

The appointment of Estonia's representative to the Council of Europe will be under discussion at a joint meeting of the parliamentary speakership and the Foreign Ministry May 31.

### Defense Ministry Chancellor Dismissed

*LD1705164193 Tallinn Radio Estonia International Service in Estonian 1600 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Defense Minister Hain Rebas has dismissed Priit Heinsalu who until now has been the [Defense] ministry's chancellor, and appointed Hannes Walter who until now has been the ministry's adviser, to replace him.

Government officials and the Defense Ministry have refused to reveal the background to Heinsalu's dismissal. According to Illar Hallaste, chairman of the Riigikogu [parliament] Fatherland faction, Heinsalu did not cope with his duties.

### Swedish Defense Minister Arrives on Visit

*LD1805111393 Tallinn Radio Tallinn in Estonian 1700 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Today [17 May] Swedish Defense Minister Anders Bjorck arrived in Estonia on a two-day visit. The defense minister's visit began with a military reception ceremony at Tallinn airport. Today the visitor familiarized himself with Maarjamae History Museum and met Estonian Defense Minister Hain Rebas. Tomorrow President Lennart Meri and Prime Minister Mart Laar will receive the Swedish defense minister. Anders Bjorck has talks planned with Defense Minister Hain Rebas and a meeting with Interior Minister Lagle Parek and Riigikogu State-Defense Committee Chairman Rein Helme.

Hain Rebas told ETA [Estonian Telegraph Agency] that Sweden has continued to help us build our defense

forces. This time, future material assistance and training issues will be under discussion. Sweden has plans to help Estonia to organize protection of air and sea borders. Concrete proposals to this end have been proposed by Sweden.

Tomorrow at noon the Swedish defense minister will hold a press conference at Toompea.

## Latvia

### State Minister Views Russian Troop Withdrawal Talks

*LD1705164493 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1300 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] The Russian delegation for talks with Latvia on Russian troop withdrawal from Latvia arrived in Riga today. The talks began at the Daina Holiday Hotel in Jurmala an hour ago. Before the beginning of the talks, our correspondent Janis Podins asked State Minister Janis Dinevics, head of the Latvian delegation, to the microphone and asked him to answer first of all the question of why Russia is so suddenly ready to sit down again at the negotiating table.

[Begin recording] [Dinevics] It was known about a week ago that talks were possible at this time, the only problem which then remained was that Mr. Zotov had to find out whether all the members of the delegation were in Moscow and could fly to Riga. It is a pleasure that all of them were there, and today this delegation will be here.

I think that as far as political changes are concerned, then it is somewhat difficult to reason how the talks will specifically proceed at the table. However, I have already pointed out that to my mind rather broad activities have begun in various spheres. For example, as you know the Ministry of Defense in Vilnius in the morning [sentence incomplete as heard]. Today in principle the delegation of the Foreign Ministry, it should be more considered, let us say, the one of the Foreign Ministry, it is, it is here with us [sentence as heard]. Therefore, it is possible, possible that there may be some new turns. But what turns, that should be (?begun).

[Podins] What changes may have occurred in the standpoint of the Latvian delegation concerning Russia? Or did they not occur? Or maybe Russia's standpoints have changed? Because the results of the referendum have, nevertheless, influenced something.

[Dinevics] I think we will learn about that at the negotiating table. We have continued the work which was begun on separate agreements. It is possible to sign several of them here and the next round of talks is envisaged for the end of the month in Moscow. Experts have also accomplished some work. So, there is a possibility to move forward.

[Podins] What is Latvia's maximum program for this round of talks?

[Dinevics] It is rather difficult to set this maximum before I have talked with Mr. Zotov. I would rather set the minimum. Well, I think that as a minimum at the two last rounds before the elections, we should maybe try to sign at least agreements which have been initialled and coordinated between both delegations and also considered by the Latvian government. [end recording]

### Russian Team Suggests Army Remain Until 2003

*LD1805091393 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 0530 GMT 18 May 93*

[Text] Talks between Latvia and Russia on the Russian troop withdrawal began yesterday. The head of the Russian delegation suggested that the Army should stay at Skrunda until the year 2003. This is reported in today's issue of the DIENA newspaper.

### Prime Minister Meets With IMF Experts

*LD1705192893 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1700 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis met experts of an IMF mission today. The aim of the regular visit of the mission is to check how the Latvian Government is following the economic policy recommendations of this international organization and how the IMF forecasts on the development of the Latvian national economy are being fulfilled.

Particular attention was paid during the discussion to the decision to increase pensions, passed recently by the government. The IMF experts are dissatisfied with the present lack of financial backing for the decision, resulting from the failure to find sources which would increase the revenue part of the budget to compensate for the increased spending.

### Swedish Defense Minister Offers Military Hardware

*LD1705171093 Stockholm Sveriges Radio Network in Swedish 1445 GMT 17 May 93*

[Text] Defense Minister Anders Bjorck, who is visiting Latvia, has promised his hosts that Sweden is prepared to help the Baltic states to build up a joint Baltic radar network for the supervision of their territories.

[Reporter] The three Baltic defense ministers agreed during last winter to seek to build up a joint network of radar stations for the supervision of their land and sea borders as well as their airspace, since it would be too expensive for the three countries to build up their own separate systems. The Swedish government will decide this week or next to study how such a monitoring system might look, what technology is needed, and how much it would cost. The study is to be carried out by the Defense Materiel Administration and the Research Institute of the Swedish National Defense, and it is to be completed

as early as September. According to Defense Minister Anders Bjoerck, the costs will total tens of millions of crowns, and the issue will therefore will be raised in the discussion of next year's state budget.

According to the defense minister, this is primarily an aid project, rather than a desire by Sweden to strengthen its own supervision of the Baltic region.

[Begin Bjorck recording] No, it is an aid project and it is totally in line with the so called sovereignty support which the parliament and government have agreed that we will provide for the Baltic states, in short, that they will be able to control their own land, sea, and air territory. They do not have that possibility today. But the sign of a sovereign is precisely that it exercises control over the land, air, and sea territory. [end recording]

[Reporter] Sweden also intends to donate a further four vessels to the Latvian coast guard in addition to those given to the Latvians last autumn. Moreover, Sweden will donate medical equipment, cross-country vehicles, and 10,000 winter uniforms to the Latvian defense. But neither Latvia nor the other Baltic countries will be able to buy any weapons until the last Russian soldier has left the three states.

## German Bundestag President Meets With Leaders

*LD1805100593 Hamburg DPA in German 0839 GMT 18 May 93*

[Text] Riga (DPA)—Bundestag [Lower House] President Rita Suessmuth began talks with the Latvian leadership today. Her first meeting in Riga was with the Latvian head of state, Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Council, and Ivars Godmanis, the chairman of the Council of Ministers.

Mrs. Suessmuth will arrive in the Estonian capital Tallinn on Wednesday, where she will also talk with the republic's leadership and parliamentary representatives. The Bundestag president plans to address students at the university in the Estonian provincial town of Tartu.